EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

By

Harvey Research Ltd.

Under Contract to

Alberta Education
Edmonton, Alberta

May, 1986

PLEASE NOTE

The views and recommendations expressed in this report are those of the researchers and are not necessarily those of the Department of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The assistance of Dr. Tom Maguire, Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta on questions of methodology and analysis is gratefully acknowledged.

We would like to thank Mr. Peter Baker, Education Consultant, Planning Services, Alberta Education, and Liaison Officer for the project, for his direction throughout the study and the Steering Committee for assistance in refining the new data collection instruments developed for this study and for providing helpful comments on the Draft Report. Members of the Steering Committee included:

P. Baker, Alberta Education
D. Balsden, Alberta Recreation and Parks
S. Coombes, Alberta Culture
D. Erickson, Alberta School Trustees Association
D. Ewasiuk, Alberta Education
N. O'Haire, Alberta Teachers' Association
F. Sonada, Alberta Advanced Education
H. Wescott, Council of Alberta School Superintendents.

We would also like to thank all those who granted interviews and all those who completed questionnaires for this study.

ABSTRACT

This two-part study was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the Community School Program in Alberta and to recommend future directions for the program. It was carried out in early 1986. The first part of the study consisted of a replication of an evaluation conducted in 1982 that compared 15 community schools to matched non-community schools and a comparison of the replication results to the 1982 results.

In the second part of the study, additional questions concerning the committee that oversees the program, program guidelines, procedures, school staff positions, funding provisions, and other related issues were addressed. Interviews and surveys were conducted with those most directly involved.

The following aspects were reported significantly more often in community schools than in non-community schools:

* community related curriculum
* involvement of parents and community members as volunteers and in providing advice on the school curriculum, although the latter happened less frequently than the former
* educational activities for people of all ages
* involvement of community adults as resource personnel; inconsistent reports on use of students as resource people
* communication between school administration and community organizations and agencies regarding new developments in the school and referrals of residents to school activities
* design features and building modifications that would enhance community school operation
* school-organized activities that foster cooperative relations with the community and likelihood that the school program has resulted in effective communication between the

community and the school.

There were no significant differences between community and non-community schools on:

- involvement of teachers by the school board or school administration in decision-making
- participation of students with people of all ages in educational activities
- agency involvement with the school on sponsoring activities in the school program, asking or being given help with services provided, using school facilities whenever needed, school referral of community residents to agencies, jointly pursuing a project with the school, perceived duplication of agency services by the school, or effective communication between school and agency
- study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum (according to most groups)
- making community members feel welcome at the school (according to most groups)

There were very few significant differences reported in community schools between 1982 and 1986 on the replication questions.

The Interdepartmental Community School Committee (IDCSC) was found to fulfill an important role in bringing together the four departments that put resources into the community school program. Some modifications were recommended to improve the functioning of the Committee.

Selection criteria for choosing community schools were found to be too narrow and an assessment of the school as well as the charter on both the bases of need and merit was recommended.

The charter development process for schools requesting grant

support was found to be sound; some streamlining and refocussing was recommended.

The definitions of community school leadership positions were found to have some overlap among them as well as overlap with other positions in the school and in community agencies. It was recommended that member departments work out a more complementary solution to leadership needs than that defined by the original position descriptions.

Alterations to current funding arrangements were proposed so that additional schools could receive community school funding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	ix
Introduction	1
Background to the Study	1
Terms of Reference	2
Study Limitations	5
Definitions	5
Organization of the Report	5
Procedures	6
Replication of 1982 Study	6
School Sample Selection	6
Questionnaire Respondents	6
Design of Survey Questionnaires	9
Data Analysis	9
School Interviews	10
Comparison of Replication and 1982 Data	13
1986 Research Questions	13
Analysis of Replication Study Data	15
Introduction	15
Study Question #1 -- Community-related Curriculum	16
Study Question #2 -- Involvement of Parents and Community Members	23
Study Question #3 -- Participation in Decision-making	30
Study Question #4 -- Programs for People of All Ages	33
Study Question #5 -- Adults and Students as Resource Personnel	38
Study Question #6 -- Interagency Cooperation	41
Study Question #7 -- Facility Adaptation	48
Study Question #8 -- Community Use of School Facilities	51
Study Question #9 -- Community Issues	55
Study Question #10 -- Sense of Community	58
Community School Coordinators	62
Correlations of Group Response and School Enrollment	65
Comparison of Group Response and Year School Obtained Charter	67
Summary	68

Analysis of 1986 Research Question Data..... 71
Assessment of Interdepartmental Community School Committee.. 71
Terms of Reference for the IDCSC..... 71
Committee Membership..... 72
Committee Activities..... 72
Executive Director Position in Terms of the IDCSC..... 76
Perceptions of the IDCSC..... 78
Support to the Program from Member Departments..... 80
Guidelines and Procedures for Approving Community Schools... 81
Impact of the Alberta Community School Program Position (ACSPP)..... 84
Community School Leadership Positions..... 87
Alternatives to the Community School Definition..... 90
Alternatives to the Community School Educational Mode..... 91
Alternatives to Community School Funding Arrangements..... 91
Adequacy of Grant for Secretarial Support, Community Use, and Flexibility..... 92
Commitment and Understanding of the Ten Dimensions of the Community School Concept..... 95
Future Implications for the Community School Program of the Management Finance Plan..... 98
Future Implications of the Secondary School Program Review.. 99
The Revision of the School Act..... 100
Future Implications of Societal Trends..... 101
Summary..... 101

Conclusions and Recommendations..... 104
1982-86 Comparison..... 104
1986 Replication Results..... 104
Modifications to the IDCSC..... 105
Evaluation of Community Schools..... 106
Selection Criteria for Community Schools..... 107
Charter Development..... 107
Community School Leadership Positions..... 108
Community Use Grant..... 109
Funding for Community Schools..... 109

Appendix..... 110

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. Community schools, grade level, enrollment and location..... 7
2. Questionnaire returns..... 8
3. Number of replication interviews in schools..... 12
4. Study question #1. Community-related curriculum questions.... 17
5. Number of schools reporting community-related curriculum activities in interviews..... 19
6. Study question #1. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 mean responses 21
7. Study question #2. Mean responses to questions regarding involvement of parents and community members..... 24
8. Types of parent and community member involvement in the school reported in interviews..... 27
9. Study question #2. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 mean responses 28
10. Study question #3. Mean responses to questions regarding involvement in decision-making..... 31
11. Types of participation in decision-making reported in interviews..... 32
12. Study question #3. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 mean responses 34
13. Study question #4. Mean responses to questions regarding provision of school programs for people of all ages.... 35
14. Programs and uses of school outside of regular school classes reported in interviews..... 36
15. Study question #4. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 mean responses 37
16. Study question #5. Mean responses to questions regarding use of students and community members as resource personnel..... 39
17. Study question #5. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 mean responses 40
18. Study question #6. Mean responses to questions regarding cooperation with community agencies..... 42
19. Study question #6. Interagency questionnaire..... 43
20. Ways schools cooperate with community agencies reported in interviews..... 45
21. Study question #6. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 mean responses 46
22. Study question #6. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 interagency questionnaire..... 47
23. Study question #7. Facilities available in surveyed schools.. 49
24. Study question #7. Numbers of schools reporting design features and modifications to facilities..... 50
25. Study question #8. Mean responses to questions regarding use of school facilities by community groups..... 52
26. Extent of school facility use reported in interviews..... 53
27. Study question #8. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 mean responses 54

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

28. Study question #9. Mean responses to questions regarding study of community issues by students..... 56
29. Study question #9. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 mean responses 57
30. Study question #10. Mean responses to questions regarding attitudes between school and community..... 59
31. The ways a school fosters community spirit according to interviews..... 60
32. Study question #10. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 mean responses 61
33. Mean responses of community school coordinators, and comparisons with 1982 responses..... 63
34. Correlation coefficients and significance of frequency response means with school enrollment..... 66
35. Impact of the community school program on staff and community 86
36. Effect of the community school concept on completion of diploma requirements..... 87
37. Alternatives to current funding arrangements..... 92
38. Adequacy of secretarial support grant..... 93
39. Adequacy of community use grant..... 94
40. Adequacy of the flexibility grant..... 95
41. Commitment needed to become a community school..... 96
42. Understanding needed to become a community school..... 98
43. Perceived effect of the secondary school program revision on community school activities..... 100

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Study

This two-part study was designed to evaluate the Community School Program in Alberta and was carried out in early 1986. The first part of the study consisted of a replication of an evaluation conducted in 1982 that compared 15 community schools to matched non-community schools and a comparison of the replication results to the 1982 results.

In the second part of the study, additional questions concerning the committee that oversees the program, program guidelines, procedures and school staff positions, funding provisions, and other related issues were addressed. Interviews and surveys were conducted with those most directly involved.

Background to the Study

The Community School Program was established in 1980 after initial discussions, pilot projects and study over an eight year period. Schools were given a five-year period of financial support upon approval of their community school proposals which were developed on an individual school basis.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Community Schools Program and to recommend future directions for the program. The end of the five-year support period granted to those schools whose proposals (called charters) were first approved has been

reached.

There are currently 67 community schools receiving grant support and many additional schools that have applied for funds but were not funded due to a funding freeze. Details of the program guidelines and operation are presented in Chapter 4 as they are examined in light of the research questions addressed.

Terms of Reference

The study conducted by W. Lazaruk in 1982 entitled, "A Comparative Analysis of Selected Designated Community Schools and Non-Designated Schools in Alberta," was to be replicated to determine the relative success of the Alberta Community School Program Position and whether or not the objectives were being achieved. Specifically the following questions concerning differences between community schools and non-community schools were to be addressed:

1. Are there differences in the school curriculum?

2. Is there a difference in the extent of parent and community member involvement?

3. Is there a difference in the extent of staff, student and community participation in decision making?

4. Is there a difference in the number and variety of additional programs offered to people of all ages?

5. Is there a difference in the number of community adults and and students who provide or assist with instruction?

6. Is there a difference in the extent and method in which cooperation with community agencies is implemented?

7. Is there a difference in the design and adaptation of school facilities for community use?

8. Is there a difference in the extent to which school facilities are used by community groups?

9. Is there a difference in the extent to which problems and issues of significance to the community are studied?

10. Is there a difference in the attitude of students and teachers toward the community and of the community toward the school?

Each of the above questions relates directly to the official ten dimensions of the Community School Program and the objectives are implied by the dimensions.

The replication study was to provide, for each of the ten questions, an indication of any changes over time in the operation and impact of community schools as well as a current comparison of community schools to non-community schools.

In addition to the replication study questions, nine other questions (to be referred to as the 1986 research questions) were to be addressed as follows:

1. Assessment of the Interdepartmental Community School Committee (IDCSC)
   a. How appropriate are the organization, role, functions, etc. of the Committee?
   b. How effective has the Committee been in carrying out its mandate?

c. Are there alternatives to this committee that are more appropriate and functional?

2. How supportive are the four Departments of the IDCSC (i.e., Alberta Education, Advanced Education, Culture and Recreation and Parks) of the Alberta Community School Program Position (ACSPP)? What is their impact on the program?

3. Are the guidelines and procedures for approving community schools satisfactory? Are there better alternatives?

4. What is the impact of the ACSPP on a community i.e., on parents, community members, interagency people, students, school staff and support staff?

5. How effective are the community school leadership people in their roles i.e., principals, vice-principals, curriculum coordinators and community school coordinators? Are these positions needed? What improvements would be desirable?

6. What are the perceptions of people associated with the community school program concerning: possible alternative to the community school definition? other educational modes? different funding arrangements?

7. What is the perceived adequacy of particular ACSPP financial provisions i.e., secretarial support, community use and flexibility?

8. How great a commitment to and an understanding of the community school concept is needed to determine the generalizability of the program to non-community schools? Is there a linkage between commitment and understanding with workability?

9. What are the possible future implications for the community school

program as a result of recent developments and proposed future changes in education, e.g., Management Finance Plan, revision of Secondary School programs, revision of the School Act, and societal trends?

Study Limitations

Data collected in this study, aside from review of documents, were based on respondent opinions. Factual checks were not carried out; however, any inconsistencies between respondent groups were noted.

Sampling of schools was not random. Half the schools were retained from the 1982 study; the balance were selected to represent the present cross-section of community schools.

Definitions

Community School - A school which has been designated a community school by the IDCSC and which receives Community School Grant funding.

Non-Community School - A school which has not been designated a community school and which does not receive Community School Grant funding. It may, however, undertake community-related initiatives on its own initiative.

Organization of the Report

The remainder of the report consists of four chapters: Procedures, Analysis of Replication Study Data, Analysis of 1986 Research Question Data, and Conclusions and Recommendations. Copies of all instruments used for data collection are included in the Appendix.

PROCEDURES

Replication of 1982 Study

School Sample Selection

The methods for the replication study closely paralleled the 1982 study. The sample size and selection methods were similar to those in 1982.

Eight of the 15 community schools were retained from the 1982 sample along with the matched non-community schools. Seven schools with 1982 charters were selected to represent the overall distribution of community schools in Alberta in 1986 and a matched non-community school was selected from either the same or a neighboring jurisdiction for each. The community schools selected for the 1986 data collection by grade level, size, and location are summarized in Table 1. For one community school, two control schools were required to match the grade range of the community school. As in the 1982 study, the data for the two control schools were combined and the schools considered as one.

Questionnaire Respondents

As in 1982, eight groups were selected to receive questionnaires. These were: principals, community school coordinators, teachers, parents, community members who were not parents, grade six students, grade nine to twelve students, and representatives of community agencies and organizations. In addition, principals were asked to

Table 1

Community Schools, Grade Level, Enrollment and Location

Number of Schools	Grades	Enrollment*	Location	
			Urban	Rural
5	1-7	170-452	5	
5	1-9	74-275	2	3
1	7-12	423		1
2	1-12	430-1057	1	1
1	10-12	904	1	
1	7-9	579	1	

* data as of September 1985, Alberta Education

complete a "facility adaptation" questionnaire regarding school facilities. Copies of each questionnaire are in the Appendix.

The same questionnaire forms were sent to the principals in each school with instructions for selecting the samples, as in 1982. It was requested that 20 each of teachers, students, and parents, and 10 community members be included, and five agency representatives be identified. One each of the principal, community school coordinator and facility adaptation questionnaires were included for each school (no community school coordinator form was included for non-community (control) schools.) Smaller schools with fewer teachers or students were asked to complete as many forms as possible.

Table 2 indicates the numbers of questionnaires sent and returned. Response rate was high except for the Community Member category. The only problems encountered by principals were in

Table 2

Questionnaire Returns

	Principal	Teacher	Comm. Member	Parent	Inter-Agency	Grade 6	Grade 9-12	Comm. Coord.*	Facility Adaptation	Total
Community Schools										
Returned	15	191	64	216	61	88	175	13	14	837
Expected	15	261	150	300	75	100	200	15	15	1131
Percent	100	73.2	42.7	72	81.3	88	87.5	86.7	93.3	73.5
Non-Community Schools										
Returned	16	190	61	229	47	89	204		16	852
Expected	16	249	160	320	80	100	220		16	1161
Percent	100	76.3	38.1	71.6	58.8	89	92.7		100	73.4

* Community School position only

collecting returns from community members and from parents with limited English. Many non-community schools reported having fewer than five agency contacts to draw on.

Design of Survey Questionnaires

Survey questionnaires were identical to those used in 1982 (see Appendix). The response choices for frequency of occurrence of items was: 1--never

2--seldom (1-2 per year)

3--occasionally (3-4 per year)

4--often (5-8 per year)

5--very often (9 or more per year)

The response choices for importance of items was:

1--of no importance

2--of limited importance

3--of average importance

4--of considerable importance

5--of critical importance

Yes/no questions were coded yes=1, no=2.

Data Analysis

As discussed above, the schools were selected in matched pairs, so that each community school was matched with a non-community school on the basis of size, grade levels and geographic location. This approach was used so that results could be compared with those of the 1982 study.

Mean responses were calculated for each item for each respondent group in each school; t-tests for correlated means were then computed for the paired schools; the results indicated if there were significant

differences (at the .05 level) in the responses to the items between the community and non-community school groups.

In a few cases there was no response to an item from any member of the group. In these cases the data from the matching school was also discarded in order to maintain the validity of the matched pair test. Consequently several of the tests involved only 13 or 14 pairs instead of the 15 expected.

As in 1982, a chi-square test (with Yates correction) was used to determine differences in the responses of community and non-community schools to the facility adaptation questionnaire.

Also as in 1982, correlation coefficients were calculated to indicate if there was a relationship between response to items and size (enrollment) of the schools. Only community school groups were tested for this relationship.

Cross-tabulations were conducted between year the school obtained its community school charter and response means from principals, teachers and parents.

The community school coordinator position is unique to community schools so no matched pair t-test was possible. The mean responses of the fifteen coordinators are provided in a table in the following chapter.

School Interviews

Following the method of the 1982 study, replication interviews to follow up the questions in the surveys were conducted in four of the community schools and their matched comparison schools. A request was made to conduct interviews with the principal, five teachers, ten

students, five community members, five parents, two inter-agency representatives and community school coordinators, curriculum coordinators and further education coordinators. (For a description of community school leadership positions, see p. 87-88.) Instructions for sampling were mailed to the school in advance of the visit.

Interviews were all in person with the exception of some telephone interviews with inter-agency representatives, parents and community members. Interviews with teachers and students were conducted in small groups. Some parents were also interviewed in small groups.

Difficulties were encountered finding schools in the sample to visit that did not feel they had already had their share of evaluations. One school reported being evaluatated 15 times since becoming a community school. Interviews took place at three community schools with 1982 charters and one with a 1981 charter. The latter had already had a team evaluation of the Community School Program four months previously that used the same cross-section of interviewees and interview questions as in this study. The report of that evaluation was made available and interviews were conducted with the principal and community school coordinator only in that school.

Community schools that were visited included an urban junior high school, a rural grade 1-12 school, a rural grade 1-9 school and an urban elementary school. Matched non-community schools were also visited. Interviews at each school took one day.

Replication interview questions were asked in community and non-community schools as indicated in Table 3.

As well as the replication interview questions, additional questions were also included in the interviews as is explained in the following section. The additional questions required the full

interview time available for the community school principals; there was, therefore, no time for the replication interview questions. Time did not permit replication interview questions of teachers and students at one community school or of the community school coordinator at another community school where the principal was also the community school coordinator.

In the reporting of responses to the replication interview questions, answers were pooled across respondent groups. As in the 1982 study, the interview responses were used for background or amplification of the survey responses and are presented as such in this report.

Table 3
Number of Replication Interviews in Schools

	Community		Non-Community	
	# schools	#inter-viewed	# schools	# inter-viewed
Principal	0	0	4	4
Community School Coordinators	3	3		
Teachers	2	10	4	20
Community Members	3	12	4	10
Parents	3	14	4	22
Inter-Agency Representatives	3	7	3	5
Students	2	20	4	40

Comparison of Replication and 1982 Data

A comparison of 1986 and 1982 community school survey responses was carried out using t-tests; the results indicated if there were significant differences (at the .05 level) in the responses to items between community school groups in 1986 and community school groups in 1982. A comparison of mean responses of community school coordinators in 1982 and 1986 was carried out using t-tests for unmatched groups.

A chi-square test (with Yates correction) was used to determine differences in responses of community schools in 1986 and 1982 to the facility adaptation questionnaire.

1986 Research Questions

Questions were developed to address each of the nine study questions that were new to the 1986 study. The questions were tailored for specific respondent groups and were reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee. The additional questions asked of each respondent group are included in the Appendix.

Questions were asked of the following people during community school interviews:

- 4 principals
- 15 teachers
- 2 curriculum coordinators
- 14 parents
- 12 community members

and of the following during non-community school interviews:

- 4 principals
- 20 teachers
- 22 parents
- 10 community members.

In addition to those interviewed in schools the following cross-section of people responded to the 1986 questions concerning the community school program:

15 school board representatives including chairmen, superintendents and spokesmen

9 community school principals

4 community school Friends

5 Interdepartmental Community School Committee members plus the Executive Director

4 Assistant Deputy Ministers from 3 Departments

2 Senior Alberta Education Officials (re School Act and Secondary Education Program Review)

A total of 10 School Boards out of the 12 who had community schools in the study are represented by the first category of respondents. In two cases the same or highly similar responses were submitted for both the Superintendent and the School Board Chairman. In these cases, the same answer from both was treated as one response. All community school principals from whom data were collected in the replication study were invited to respond; two did not. In the case of community school Friends, five names were randomly sampled from the list of Friends.

Responses were collected through personal interviews with the Assistant Deputy Ministers, IDCSC members, two senior Alberta Education officials and spokesmen for the two largest school boards in the province, telephone or mailed survey with community school Friends and principals and mailed survey with school board chairmen and superintendents.

ANALYSIS OF REPLICATION STUDY DATA

Introduction

The 1982 study hypothesized ten dimensions by which community and non-community schools might differ. These were:

1. community-related curriculum
2. involvement of parents and community members
3. participation in decision-making
4. programs for people of all ages
5. use of adult and student resource personnel
6. interagency cooperation
7. facility adaptation
8. community use of facilities
9. study of community problems and issues; and
10. development of a sense of community.

In this chapter, the results of the analysis of data collected for each of the ten dimensions are presented. In addition, comparisons between the 1986 and 1982 questionnaire response means are conducted. For each question the mean scores for a group (such as parents or teachers) were compared for the community schools and for the non-community schools. Significance of differences was tested using t-tests as in the 1982 study. School interview responses are summarized and presented as amplification of the 1986 survey results.

Study Question #1 -- Community-Related Curriculum

The questionnaire items asked if people from the community were used to enhance curriculum, and if students were involved in the community through study or special projects. There was a significant difference between community schools and non-community schools on the frequency of community-related curriculum items for all of the groups surveyed except the students (Table 4). These differences were obvious for all the items related to this Study Question. Grade 9-12 students indicated a difference on two of their five items (regarding providing community service, and preparing community-related projects); Grade 6 students showed no difference between community and non-community schools. It appears that teachers, principals, and the community, but not the students, feel that community schools use the community to enhance the curriculum, encourage students to use community facilities, and emphasize study of the community more than do non-community schools.

Principals reported activities as happening more frequently than did teachers. According to community school teachers, students go into the community to provide community service while they learn only once or twice a year, whereas principals reported the same occurrence happening more than 3 to 4 times a year. This may represent the difference in perception between seeing activities across the school and activities within one class.

The responses indicated a difference between community and non-community schools for most groups, except the students, regarding the importance of the items. The issues of students going into the community to use available resources, and to provide community service while they learn, were not as different between community and non-community schools as were other issues.

Table 4

Study Question #1. Mean Responses to Community-related Curriculum Questions

		Principals								Teachers								Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school uses human community resources to enhance the school curriculum	Comm.	15	4.8	.41	4.43^{***}	15	4.53	.52	3.91^{**}	15	3.47	.45	4.50^{***}	15	3.75	.39	3.97^{**}	10	2.48	.51	1.14	10	3.15	.30	.902
	Non-Comm.	15	3.67	.98		15	3.63	.72		15	2.86	.25		15	3.32	.23		10	2.24	.44		10	3.03	.29	
Students go into the community to use available facilities and resources	Comm.	15	4.73	.46	3.61^{**}	15	4.67	.62	4.53^{***}	15	3.40	.44	3.55^{**}	15	3.85	.45	3.41	10	2.65	.93	1.99	10	3.36	.43	.582
	Non-Comm.	15	3.7	.0		15	3.73	.88		15	2.83	.51		15	3.38	.31		10	2.17	.60		10	3.28	.42	
Students go into the community to provide community service while they learn	Comm.	15	3.53	.06	3.80^{**}	15	3.47	.99	.70	15	2.24	.41	6.27^{***}	15	3.06	.46	3.07^{**}	10	1.91	.58	2.48^{*}	10	2.70	.57	.77
	Non-Comm.	15	2.37	.14		15	3.23	.86		15	1.59	.24		15	2.6	.28		10	1.48	.28		10	2.51	.37	
The school emphasizes the study of the local community	Comm.	15	4.13	.83	3.76^{**}	15	4.33	.72	3.76^{**}	15	3.37	.51	2.72^{*}	15	3.58	.43	1.21	10	1.96	.30	1.28	10	2.64	.30	-.24
	Non-Comm.	15	3.07	.96		15	3.4	.83		15	2.99	.44		15	3.39	.46		10	1.82	.37		10	2.69	.48	
I prepare community related projects with my class	Comm.																	10	2.10	.45	2.92^{*}	10	2.73	.43	1.26
	Non-Comm.																	10	1.66	.22		10	2.45	.47	

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level
*** = .001 level

n = number of schools
$\bar{x}$ = mean
s = standard deviation

Table 4 (Continued)

Study Question #1. Mean Responses to Community-related Curriculum Questions

		Grade Six Students								Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school uses human community resources to enhance the school curriculum	Comm.	5	1.05	.09	.10					15	3.97	.39	6.41^{***}	15	3.84	.24	4.01^{**}	11	4.18	.62	4.87^{***}	11	4.07	.31	4.48^{***}
	Non-Comm.	5	1.04	.07						15	3.01	.55		15	3.47	.29		11	3.02	.40		11	3.5	.54	
Students go into the community to use available facilities and resources	Comm.	5	1.04	.90	.15					15	3.94	.28	4.93^{***}	15	3.94	.21	2.97^{*}	12	3.94	.41	3.74^{**}	12	3.96	.40	1.50
	Non-Comm.	5	1.03	.07						15	3.18	.47		15	3.65	.27		12	3.02	.83		12	3.70	.54	
Students go into the community to provide community service while they learn	Comm.	5	1.27	.23	-1.26					15	2.91	.44	6.55^{***}	15	3.51	.38	1.75	11	3.22	.67	4.65^{***}	11	3.68	.46	1.27
	Non-Comm.	5	1.57	.41						15	2.15	.52		15	3.30	.35		11	2.23	.52		11	3.37	.68	
The school emphasizes the study of the local community	Comm.	5	1.26	.22	-.65					15	3.38	.41	2.94^{**}	15	3.68	.24	4.05^{**}	12	4.05	.63	3.99^{**}	12	3.98	.26	2.73^{*}
	Non-Comm.	5	1.43	.46						15	2.77	.58		15	3.30	.31		12	2.64	.72		12	3.46	.63	
My class studied communities in the world	Comm.	5	1.11	.12	.19																				
	Non-Comm.	5	1.10	.10																					
I prepared community related projects with my class	Comm.	5	1.26	.28	-1.88																				
	Non-Comm.	5	1.65	.43																					

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level
*** = .001 level

The results of the school interviews are indicated in Table 5. The numbers in the table show the range of activities but not the extent of each activity. Since only a sample cross-section of people were asked the question in each school, some school activities were probably not reported.

Table 5

Number of Schools Reporting Community-Related Curriculum Activities in Interviews

	Community (n=4)	Non-Community (n=4)
Field trips	4	3
Guest speakers	3	4
Study of local community	4	4
Study of community services	4	3
Use of community materials in class	4	3
Special projects in the community	2	1
Student exchanges	2	1

Teachers pointed out in the school interviews that study of the community is now built into the Alberta School curriculum in many subjects and grade levels. Relating classroom learning to the community is a function of teacher attitude and teaching style. Teachers said they would teach the same way whether they had the Community School Grant or not and those that had been in the school for some years said

they had been including community-related study and activities in their teaching before the school became a community school.

Field trips were the most common interpretation of relating curriculum to the community. Remote communities have few local sites to visit and travel to urban centres is costly. Fund-raising for field trips and student travel to distant provinces and Europe were reported in two community schools and two non-community schools. One community school reported that fund-raising had tripled since they became a community school. Arranging field trips was one of the responsibilities of either the community school coordinator or the curriculum coordinator in the four community schools.

There were very few significant differences between the responses given by community school groups in 1982 and in 1986 (Table 6). Teachers and community members now feel that the schools emphasize study of the local community more frequently than they did in 1982; and the community members now feel that study of the local community is more important than in 1982; community members also believe that the schools' use of community human resources to enhance the curriculum is more important than they did in 1982.

Table 6

Study Question #1. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Principals								Teachers								Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school uses human community resources to enhance the school curriculum	1982	15	4.73	.46	-.44	15	4.6	.51	.36	15	3.2	.43	-1.71	15	3.62	.29	-1.03	9	2.39	.78	-.29	9	3.23	.29	.59
	1986	15	4.8	.41		15	4.53	.52		15	3.47	.45		15	3.75	.39		10	2.48	.51		10	3.15	.30	
Students go into the community to use available facilities and resources	1982	15	4.67	.62	-.32	15	4.6	.51	-.32	15	3.31	.51	-.54	15	3.77	.27	-.59	9	2.37	.57	-.78	9	3.44	.27	.47
	1986	15	4.73	.46		15	4.67	.62		15	3.40	.44		15	3.85	.45		10	2.65	.93		10	3.36	.43	
Students go into the community to provide community service while they learn	1982	15	3.67	1.23	.33	15	3.93	1.03	1.26	15	2.01	.38	-1.58	15	3.11	.36	.33	9	1.83	.42	-.32	9	2.71	.33	.05
	1986	15	3.53	1.06		15	3.47	.99		15	2.24	.41		15	3.06	.46		10	1.91	.58		10	2.70	.57	
The school emphasizes the study of the local community	1982	15	4.2	.78	.27	15	4.27	.79	-.229	15	2.99	.51	-2.05*	15	3.47	.5	-.64	9	1.76	.28	-1.53	9	2.64	.4	-.02
	1986	15	4.13	.83		15	4.33	.72		15	3.37	.51		15	3.58	.43		10	1.96	.30		10	2.64	.30	

significance
* = .05 level

Table 6 (Continued)

Study Question #1. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Grade Six Students								Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school uses human community resources to enhance the school curriculum	1982	6	1.04	.05	-.24					15	3.75	.39	-1.53	15	3.71	.34	-1.18	14	3.79	.52	-1.74	14	3.58	.39	-3.40**
	1986	5	1.05	.09						15	3.97	.39		15	3.84	.24		11	4.18	.62		11	4.07	.31	
Students go into the community to use available facilities and resources	1982	6	1.1	.18	.67					15	3.79	.44	-1.10	15	3.81	.40	-1.03	14	3.72	.79	-.88	14	3.6	.49	-2.03
	1986	5	1.04	.09						15	3.94	.28		15	3.94	.21		12	3.94	.41		12	3.96	.40	
Students go into the community to provide community service while they learn	1982	6	1.47	.25	1.39					15	3.02	.63	.54	15	3.62	.44	.69	14	3.2	1.01	-.06	14	3.51	.59	-.77
	1986	5	1.27	.23						15	2.91	.44		15	3.52	.38		11	3.22	.67		11	3.68	.46	
The school emphasizes the study of the local community	1982	6	1.34	.30	.49					15	3.37	.51	-.08	15	3.69	.36	.09	14	3.32	.52	-3.26**	14	3.41	.6	-3.03**
	1986	5	1.26	.22						15	3.38	.41		15	3.68	.24		12	4.05	.63		12	3.98	.26	
My class studied communities in the world	1982	6	1.15	.17	.40																				
	1986	5	1.11	.12																					
I prepared community related projects with my class	1982	6	1.32	.26	.35																				
	1986	5	1.26	.28																					

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

Study Question #2 -- Involvement of Parents and Community Members

The items addressing this Study Question related to the role that parents and community members play in providing advice on curriculum and in helping teachers through voluntary service.

Some clear differences showed up between community and non-community schools (Table 7). Teachers and parents reported significantly more frequent involvement of the community in community schools than in non-community schools on all four items and the principals, on three items. Principals did not report a difference in the frequency of parents advising the school regarding the curriculum between community and non-community schools. Principals did report a significant difference in the frequency of community members other than parents providing advice on school curriculum. Community members indicated that community schools involve them in assisting teachers more than do non-community schools. Grade 9-12, but not Grade 6, students indicated that community school parents visit the school more often than do parents of non-community school students.

It should be noted that although a number of significant differences showed up between community and non-community schools, the absolute scores were often low, indicating that the respondents did not feel the level of involvement was high. For example, teachers' scores were low, indicating infrequent involvement of the community in curriculum advice. The only score above 3 (occasionally -- 3 to 4 times per year) was the item regarding parents assisting teachers voluntarily. Parents and community members, on the other hand, felt that they did contribute, both to advice on the curriculum and to assisting teachers.

Teachers in community schools had significantly higher scores on the importance scale for the items in this Study Question than did teachers in non-community schools. Again, the scores were not

Table 7

Study Question #2. Mean Responses to Questions Regarding Involvement of Parents and Community Members

		Principals								Teachers								Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school involves parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	Comm.	15	3.2	.86	1.08	15	3.67	1.05	1.86	15	2.39	.40	3.19**	15	2.87	.31	2.63*	10	2.18	.88	1.43	10	2.60	.72	.93
	Non-Comm.	15	2.83	.88		15	3.1	1.04		15	1.86	.43		15	2.48	.53		10	1.83	.33		10	2.37	.27	
The school involves parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	Comm.	15	4.73	.59	3.14**	15	4.73	.46	3.87**	15	3.46	.87	3.91**	15	3.80	.57	3.36**	10	2.63	.39	2.05	10	2.76	.47	1.55
	Non-Comm.	15	3.9	1.28		15	3.73	1.03		15	2.93	.83		15	3.34	.57		10	2.27	.36		10	2.48	.30	
The school involves community members other than parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	Comm.	15	3.13	1.13	3.25**	15	3.13	.92	1.72	15	2.43	.52	5.14***	15	2.86	.36	5.07***								
	Non-Comm.	15	1.77	1.02		15	2.53	.99		15	1.61	.35		15	2.32	.33									
The school involves community members other than parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	Comm.	15	4.2	.68	3.10**	14	4.	.96	2.33*	15	2.98	.52	5.55***	15	3.39	.50	3.10**								
	Non-Comm.	15	3.13	1.13		14	3.07	.92		15	2.04	.35		15	2.81	.50									
My parents come to visit the school	Comm.																	10	2.59	.55	3.16*	10	2.78	.43	-.87
	Non-Comm.																	10	2.27	.37		10	2.90	.27	

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level
*** = .001 level

Table 7 (Continued)

Study Question #2. Mean Responses to Questions Regarding Involvement of Parents and Community Members

		Grade Six Students								Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school involves parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	Conv.									15	3.16	.58	3.45**	15	3.79	.30	2.72*	11	3.16	1.08	.88	11	3.60	.85	.11
	Non-Conv.									15	2.55	.60		15	3.58	.27		11	2.83	.59		11	3.57	.53	
The school involves parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	Conv.	5	1.34	.33	.29					15	4.17	.72	3.94**	15	3.97	.41	2.65*	11	4.06	.86	1.14	11	4.21	.59	3.23**
	Non-Conv.	5	1.27	.35						15	3.55	.84		15	3.70	.40		11	3.75	.67		11	3.75	.57	
The school involves community members other than parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	Conv.									15	2.97	.56	3.18**	15	3.27	.41	2.56*	11	3.12	.93	1.12	11	3.42	.63	.61
	Non-Conv.									15	2.36	.51		15	2.96	.33		11	2.6	.84		11	3.30	.53	
The school involves community members other than parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	Conv.									15	3.27	.51	5.17***	15	3.4	.36	2.66*	12	3.73	1.00	2.83*	12	3.56	.60	2.55*
	Non-Conv.									15	2.47	.37		15	3.08	.27		12	2.84	.45		12	2.96	.7	
My parents come to visit the school	Conv.	5	1.09	.09	-.38																				
	Non-Conv.	5	1.11	.07																					

especially high, and were under 3 (of average importance) for the questions regarding the role of the community in advising on curriculum. Principals had relatively high scores (over 3) regarding the importance of involving the community, as did parents and community members. Students had low scores, and were not different from students in non-community schools.

School interviews (Table 8) indicated that parental curricular advice was sought rarely and only on isolated matters such as a multi-cultural program, combining grades 1 to 3 into one primary group, extent of instruction in the French language, and reviewing books before shelving in the school library.

Community schools are expected to have a Parent Advisory Committee. Two community schools had community members who were neither parents nor agency representatives on the committee, as well. One community school had a Parent Committee for each elementary class, one for junior high and one for senior high. One non-community school has an informal band parents association. The advisory committee for one non-community school was only for the ECS level. The principal at one non-community school held evening coffee hours for input from parents of students in grades 1 to 6.

Many of the parents interviewed in non-community schools expressed the wish that they could be asked to help out, particularly in grades higher than 1 and 2 where there already was some use of volunteers. By junior high, parent volunteers reported they mainly help band members and athletic team members attend their various events in both community and non-community schools.

Table 8

Types of Parent and Community Member Involvement in the School Reported in Interviews

	Community School Involvement of		Non-Community School Involvement of	
	Parents	Community Members	Parents	Community Members
Parental curricular advice	1	--	2	--
Classroom volunteer	4	2	3	1
Resource person in class	3	3	2	3
Advisory Committee	4	2	2	--
Other committees	1	--	1	--
Home visits	1	--	--	--
Surveys	2	1	--	--
Principal's coffee hour	--	--	1	--

Since 1982, community school teachers have observed a significant increase in volunteer help from community members and parents; and both community school teachers and principals assign higher importance to having parent volunteers. Community members also feel that voluntary assistance to teachers is more important than they did in 1982 (Table 9). Students have not significantly changed their (relatively low) reports regarding the frequency of community involvement in the schools.

Table 9

Study Question #2. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Principals								Teachers								Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school involves parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	1982	14	3.36	1.01	.46	14	3.86	.66	.59	15	2.17	.46	-1.38	15	2.93	.44	.42	9	1.86	.45	-.99	9	2.48	.63	-.38
	1986	15	3.2	.86		15	3.67	1.05		15	2.39	.40		15	2.87	.31		10	2.18	.88		10	2.60	.72	
The school involves parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	1982	15	4.13	1.06	-1.92	15	4.07	.88	-2.59*	15	2.74	.92	-2.20*	15	3.38	.5	-2.15*	9	2.58	.64	-.22	9	2.8	.51	.19
	1986	15	4.73	.59		15	4.73	.46		15	3.46	.87		15	3.80	.57		10	2.63	.39		10	2.76	.47	
The school involves community members other than parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	1982	15	2.93	1.03	-.52	15	3.27	1.28	.34	15	2.13	.41	-1.78	15	2.79	.42	-.557								
	1986	15	3.13	1.13		15	3.13	.92		15	2.43	.52		15	2.86	.36									
The school involves community members other than parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	1982	15	3.8	1.15	-1.16	15	4.13	.92	.39	15	2.34	.44	-3.64**	15	3.1	.39	-1.79								
	1986	15	4.2	.68		15	4	.93		15	2.98	.52		15	3.39	.50									
My parents come to visit the school	1982																	9	2.18	.41	-1.81	9	2.97	.52	.88
	1986																	10	2.59	.55		10	2.78	.43	

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

Table 9 (continued)

Study Question #2. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Grade Six Students								Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school involves parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	1982									15	3.27	.75	.44	15	3.82	.47	.19	14	3.22	.57	.19	14	3.79	.4	.76
	1986									15	3.16	.58		15	3.79	.30		11	3.16	1.08		11	3.60	.85	
The school involves parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	1982	6	1.39	.14	.34					15	3.75	.85	-1.44	15	3.68	.60	-1.53	14	3.71	.83	-1.04	14	3.64	.64	-2.29*
	1986	5	1.34	.33						15	4.17	.72		15	3.97	.41		11	4.06	.86		11	4.21	.59	
The school involves community members other than parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	1982									15	3.05	.55	.38	15	3.28	.37	.04	14	2.96	.57	-.53	14	3.13	.49	-1.28
	1986									15	2.97	.56		15	3.27	.41		11	3.12	.93		11	3.42	.63	
The school involves community members other than parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	1982									15	3.22	.52	-.27	15	3.24	.5	-1.01	14	3.12	.71	-1.81	14	3.11	.53	-2.06*
	1986									15	3.27	.51		15	3.4	.36		12	3.73	1.00		12	3.56	.59	
My parents come to visit the school	1982	6	1.1	.09	.17																				
	1986	5	1.09	.09																					

Study Question #3 -- Participation in Decision-making

The questionnaire items that related to this Question involved the degree to which the school board and school administration involved teachers in the decision-making processes that affected the school and the extent to which teachers involve students in the decision-making process. The only significant differences between community and non-community schools were found among parents and community members (Table 10). (A number of parents and community members noted on the surveys that they did not have the information on which to base answers to the questions.) These groups felt that the school boards and school administration for the community schools were much better at involving the teachers in decision-making. The principals and teachers did not indicate this difference; in fact both principals and teachers of non-community schools gave higher (but non-significantly) responses than did community school principals and teachers for the item regarding administration involvement of teachers in decision-making.

Although teachers at both community and non-community schools felt highly involved in the decision-making process by school administration, and rated it high in importance, grade 9-12 students reported that teachers infrequently asked them for ideas on how the school could be better.

School interview results regarding participation in decision-making are presented in Table 11. One group of parents in a community school thought input for decisions made in school should come from the school board and not directly from parents. One parent in a non-community school said "most things were very remote. Parents were separated in most ways."

Table 10

Study Question #3. Mean Responses to Questions Regarding Involvement in Decision-making

		Principals								Teachers							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	Comm.	15	3.8	1.08	0	15	4.4	.63	.898	15	2.68	.60	1.85	15	3.98	.35	1.18
	Non-Comm.	15	3.8	1.08		15	4.2	.77		15	2.41	.47		15	3.84	.40	
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	Comm.	15	4.7	.46	-1.47	15	4.87	.35	-.27	15	4.19	.51	-1.03	15	4.58	.22	.58
	Non-Comm.	15	4.9	.28		15	4.9	.28		15	4.33	.40		15	4.54	.23	
The teacher asks for ideas on how the school could be better	Comm.																
	Non-Comm.																

		Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The teacher asks for ideas on how the school could be better	Comm.	10	2.72	.57	.116	10	3.77	.39	-.15
	Non-Comm.	10	2.69	.52		10	3.80	.56	

		Grade Six Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The teacher asks for ideas on how the school could be better	Comm.	5	1.13	.13	-1.31				
	Non-Comm.	5	1.43	.47					

		Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	Comm.	15	3.06	.48	2.15*	15	3.96	.23	3.51**	10	3.17	.56	.95	11	3.80	1.10	-.49
	Non-Comm.	15	2.77	.29		15	3.67	.32		10	2.86	.79		11	3.93	.48	
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	Comm.	15	4.15	.36	2.67*	15	4.3	.31	1.73	11	4.31	.55	2.54*	11	4.37	.80	.82
	Non-Comm.	15	3.76	.49		15	4.12	.29		11	3.89	.53		11	4.12	.42	
The teacher asks for ideas on how the school could be better	Comm.																
	Non-Comm.																

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

Table 11

Types of Participation in Decision-Making Reported in Interviews

	Community (n=4)	Non-Community (n=4)
Staff meetings	4	4
Parent advisory group	3	2
Advisory committee with staff, parents and students represented	1	--
Student Council	3	2
Student conflict management team	--	1
Surveys or invitations to respond in Newsletters	2	2

Most students did not see their Student Council as a decision-making body, and it was the only student advisory group in the school. Some students reported sitting on committees.

The Parent Advisory Committee, Advisory Committee or Management Committee (the name and cross-section of representatives varied somewhat from school to school) in Community Schools gave parents the feeling they had some input into decision-making about the school. Some schools left the spending of the flexibility grant to the discretion of this committee and parents were very aware of the power this gave them to bring changes they wanted to see into the school.

The only significant change in response between community schools from 1982 to 1986 was community members, who now believe that school administrations involve teachers in decision-making more than they used to (Table 12). Since this observation was not corroborated by any other group, the finding is of limited importance.

Study Question #4 -- Programs for People of All Ages

Two related items addressed this Study Question and asked if the school provided educational activities for people of all ages. The responses indicated a significant difference between community and non-community schools (Table 13). Community schools report providing educational activities involving people of all ages very often and it is considered highly important. Students do not report participating in educational activities in school with people of all ages any more frequently in community schools than in non-community schools.

The non-community school groups rated the importance of educational activities for people of all ages of average or higher importance. A study of the community school programs for adults and their acceptance by the community might indicate characteristics of them that would be useful to other schools planning to institute educational programs for people of different ages.

School interview results are presented in Table 14 below. One non-community school was situated in a small rural community where the community hall was the focus for community activities and community members saw no need for a change. In Edmonton, both the community school and the non-community school had close links with the Community League. Table 14 speaks for itself. Only two of the four non-community schools reported any kind of programming in the school for people of all ages compared to the four community schools which each had most of the programs listed in the table.

Table 12

Study Question #3. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Principals								Teachers							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	1982	14	3.79	1.19	-.02	14	4.14	1.17	-.752	15	2.55	.55	-.62	15	4	.29	.17
	1986	15	3.8	1.08		15	4.4	.63		15	2.68	.60		15	3.98	.35	
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	1982	15	4.93	.26	1.70	15	4.87	.35	.02	15	4.12	.65	-.35	15	4.5	.32	-.81
	1986	15	4.7	.46		15	4.87	.35		15	4.19	.51		15	4.58	.22	
The teacher asks for ideas on how the school could be better	1982																
	1986																

		Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	1982								
	1986								
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	1982								
	1986								
The teacher asks for ideas on how the school could be better	1982	9	2.91	.63	.70	9	3.91	.43	.76
	1986	10	2.72	.57		10	3.77	.39	

		Grade Six Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	1982								
	1986								
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	1982								
	1986								
The teacher asks for ideas on how the school could be better	1982	6	1.38	.32	1.62				
	1986	5	1.13	.13					

		Parents							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	1982	15	3.2	.54	.77	15	3.96	.41	.032
	1986	15	3.06	.48		15	3.96	.23	
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	1982	15	4.17	.47	.11	15	4.34	.32	.20
	1986	15	4.15	.36	.11	15	4.32	.31	
The teacher asks for ideas on how the school could be better	1982								
	1986								

		Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	1982	14	3.01	.72	-.61	14	3.75	55	-.14
	1986	10	3.18	.56		11	3.80	1.10	
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	1982	14	3.81	.6	-2.14*	14	4.12	.30	-1.09
	1986	11	4.31	.55		11	4.37	.80	
The teacher asks for ideas on how the school could be better	1982								
	1986								

significance
* = .05 level

Table 13

Study Question #4. Mean Responses to Questions Regarding Provision of School Programs for People of All Ages

		Principals								Teachers							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages	Comm.	15	4.33	.82	5.77***	15	4.47	.64	7.14***	15	4.41	.34	13.10***	15	4.32	.35	8.76***
	Non-Comm.	15	2.27	.96		15	2.77	.86		15	2.54	.37		15	3.16	.34	
I participate in educational activities in my school with people of all ages	Comm.																
	Non-Comm.																

		Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages	Comm.	10	3.9	.49	6.35***	10	3.77	.36	2.75*
	Non-Comm.	10	3.06	.43		10	3.28	.42	
I participate in educational activities in my school with people of all ages	Comm.	10	2.88	.73	.80	10	3.23	.53	1.00
	Non-Comm.	10	2.64	.53		10	3.05	.40	

		Grade Six Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages	Comm.	5	1.08	.15	-.45				
	Non-Comm.	5	1.14	.23					
I participate in educational activities in my school with people of all ages	Comm.	5	1.08	.09	-.71				
	Non-Comm.	5	1.13	.17					

		Parents							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages	Comm.	15	4.19	.60	7.30***	15	4.13	.39	5.10***
	Non-Comm.	15	2.78	.50		15	3.45	.29	
I participate in educational activities in my school with people of all ages	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								

		Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages	Comm.	12	4.28	.74	4.42**	12	4.18	.53	3.45**
	Non-Comm.	12	3.14	.53		12	3.33	.55	
I participate in educational activities in my school with people of all ages	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level
*** = .001 level

Table 14

Programs and Uses of School Outside of Regular School Classes Reported in Interviews

	Community (n=4)	Non-Community (n=4)
Preschool programs	3	2
After-school recreation programs for students outside of intra-mural sports	--	1
After-school care for elementary children	1	--
Evening use of gym by adults	3	3
Evening programs in classrooms for adults on regular basis	3	--
Weekend use of school on regular basis	4	--
Use of school facility by organized groups	3	2
Community library books in school library	1	1

There were no significant differences between the responses given in 1982 and 1986 (Table 15).

Table 15

Study Question #4. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Principals								Teachers							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages	1982	15	4.67	.62	1.27	15	4.67	.62	.883	15	4.4	.31	-.10	15	4.31	.29	-.10
	1986	15	4.33	.82		15	4.47	.64		15	4.41	.34		15	4.32	.35	
I participate in educational activities in my school with people of all ages	1982																
	1986																

		Grade Nine and Twelve Students								Grade Six Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages	1982	9	4.18	.51	1.21	9	3.95	.44	.98	6	1.07	.06	-.10				
	1986	10	3.9	.49		10	3.77	.36		5	1.08	.15					
I participate in educational activities in my school with people of all ages	1982	9	2.97	.59	.30	9	3.27	.44	.16	6	1.09	.08	.22				
	1986	10	2.88	.73		10	3.23	.53		5	1.08	.09					

		Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages	1982	15	4.4	.31	1.22	15	4.24	.44	.73	14	4.06	.47	-.91	14	4.06	.47	-.60
	1986	15	4.19	.60		15	4.13	.39		12	4.28	.74		12	4.18	.53	
I participate in educational activities in my school with people of all ages	1982																
	1986																

Study Question #5 -- Adults and Students as Resource Personnel

Two questions were addressed to adults and two to students for this Study Question asking if community adults and students were used as resources in the classroom (Table 16).

All community school groups reported significantly more involvement of community adults as resource personnel than did non-community school groups. Such involvement was also considered significantly more important by all community school groups.

The teachers, parents and community members all clearly reported that community schools do involve students as resource people in classes much more frequently than non-community schools do. Principals, teachers and parents believe it is a more important approach than do non-community school groups. The grade 9-12 students reported helping students in their own class more frequently than in other classes. There was no significant difference between community and non-community school students' ratings of the frequency of their role as resource personnel.

Interview responses consisted of examples of help with grade 1 reading by both adults and older students, and instances of resource people in specific subject areas, as well as the practice of asking students who have had a special experience to relate it to the class.

The comparisons between the 1982 and 1986 studies indicated that teachers reported students were used significantly more frequently as resource persons in 1986 than in 1982, and that community members believed that community adults are being used significantly more frequently as resource persons now than was reported in 1982. (Table 17).

Table 16

Study Question #5. Mean Responses to Questions Regarding Use of Students and Community Members as Resource Personnel

		Principals								Teachers							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel	Comm.	15	4.27	.80	2.32*	14	4.21	.80	2.90*	15	4.00	.53	9.73***	15	4.07	.343	6.84***
	Non-Comm.	15	3.17	1.46		14	3.14	1.03		15	2.83	.54		15	3.33	.32	
The school staff includes students as resource personnel	Comm.	13	3.39	.96	.94	14	4.21	.89	2.75*	15	3.44	.55	5.24***	15	3.68	.41	5.67***
	Non-Comm.	13	2.85	1.57		14	3.21	1.12		15	2.52	.69		15	3.06	.46	
I help students in my class with their learning	Comm.																
	Non-Comm.																
I help students in other classes with their learning	Comm.																
	Non-Comm.																

		Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The school staff includes students as resource personnel	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
I help students in my class with their learning	Comm.	10	3.30	.51	1.53	10	3.54	.54	1.12
	Non-Comm.	10	3.01	.41		10	3.33	.35	
I help students in other classes with their learning	Comm.	10	2.63	.6	1.89	10	3.26	.55	1.48
	Non-Comm.	10	2.23	.39		10	2.93	.44	

		Grade Six Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The school staff includes students as resource personnel	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
I help students in my class with their learning	Comm.	5	1.11	.06	-1.23				
	Non-Comm.	5	1.16	.11					
I help students in other classes with their learning	Comm.	5	1.18	.17	-.12				
	Non-Comm.	5	1.20	.14					

		Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel	Comm.	15	3.72	.45	7.33***	15	3.82	.26	4.32*	11	4.03	.70	3.06*	11	3.91	.66	2.89*
	Non-Comm.	15	2.72	.49		15	3.36	.33		11	2.74	.86		11	3.28	.60	
The school staff includes students as resource personnel	Comm.	15	3.37	.32	4.31***	15	3.61	.23	2.26*	11	3.53	.97	3.19**	11	3.51	.86	1.54
	Non-Comm.	15	2.73	.60		15	3.41	.31		11	2.64	.64		11	3.23	.44	
I help students in my class with their learning	Comm.																
	Non-Comm.																
I help students in other classes with their learning	Comm.																
	Non-Comm.																

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level
*** = .001 level

Table 17

Study Question #5. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Principals								Teachers							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel	1982	15	4.4	.83	.45	15	4.13	.74	-.25	15	3.79	.47	-1.15	15	3.82	.33	-2.06
	1986	15	4.27	.80		15	4.2	.77		15	4.00	.53		15	4.07	.34	
The school staff includes students as resource personnel	1982	14	3.86	.66	1.41	14	3.86	.77	-1.13	15	3.03	.5	-2.14*	15	3.41	.4	-1.81
	1986	14	3.43	.94		14	4.21	.89		15	3.44	.55		15	3.68	.41	
I help students in my class with their learning	1982																
	1986																
I help students in other classes with their learning	1982																
	1986																

		Grade Nine and Twelve Students								Grade Six Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel	1982																
	1986																
The school staff includes students as resource personnel	1982																
	1986																
I help students in my class with their learning	1982	9	3.07	.32	-1.17	9	3.49	.32	-.25	6	1.15	.12	.73				
	1986	10	3.30	.51		10	3.54	.54		5	1.11	.06					
I help students in other classes with their learning	1982	9	2.53	.4	-.41	9	3.1	.48	-.66	6	1.27	.14	.95				
	1986	10	2.63	.6		10	3.26	.55		5	1.18	.17					

		Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel	1982	15	3.39	.53	-1.81	15	3.62	.42	-1.60	14	3.45	.63	-2.16*	14	3.45	.55	-1.90
	1986	15	3.72	.45		15	3.82	.26		11	4.03	.70		11	3.91	.66	
The school staff includes students as resource personnel	1982	15	3.21	.42	-1.18	15	3.48	.43	-1.07	14	3.21	.89	-.87	14	3.52	.51	.03
	1986	15	3.37	.32		15	3.61	.23		11	3.53	.97		11	3.51	.86	
I help students in my class with their learning	1982																
	1986																
I help students in other classes with their learning	1982																
	1986																

Significance
* = .05 level

Study Question #6 -- Interagency Cooperation

Items in the questionnaires that addressed this Study Question involved the interaction of the schools with other agencies in providing a range of services and participation by the school in community improvement projects (Table 18).

Almost all items and groups indicated clear differences between community and non-community schools. These differences included both the frequency and importance of the items.

The item responses by the Interagency Representatives (Table 19) do not show as clear a difference between the community and non-community schools. On four of twelve items a significant difference was detected. These differences included community school administration meeting or otherwise communicating more frequently with the agency or organization to discuss new developments in the community, the school offering activities involving people of all ages more frequently and the agency referring residents to an activity offered by the community school more frequently.

Interagency representatives reported no significant differences between community and non-community schools on:

- sponsoring an activity in the school program
- asking the school for help with services the agency provides
- utilizing facilities whenever needed
- community residents being referred to the agency by the school
- jointly pursuing a project with the school
- receiving assistance from the school when asked for help
- duplication of services by the school program
- effective communication between the school and the agency.

Table 18

Study Question #6. Mean Responses to Questions Regarding Cooperation with Community Agencies

		Principals								Teachers								Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area	Comm.	15	4.73	.70	2.68*	15	4.8	.56	4.00**	15	4.59	.26	8.10***	15	4.46	.29	6.39***	10	3.75	.42	6.05***	10	3.62	.46	3.59**
	Non-Comm.	15	3.77	1.37		15	3.73	.96		15	3.10	.70		15	3.59	.52		10	2.82	.53		10	3.05	.48	
The school participates in community improvement projects	Comm.	11	3.55	.93	2.36*	11	4.	.89	3.36**	15	3.52	.50	4.90***	15	3.79	.32	3.87**								
	Non-Comm.	11	2.36	1.29		11	2.77	.75		15	2.45	.57		15	3.1	.49									

		Grade Six Students								Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area	Comm.	5	1.19	.17	-.95					15	4.21	.42	4.9***	15	4.24	.26	5.56***	12	4.30	.63	4.91***	12	4.39	.52	4.21**
	Non-Comm.	5	1.33	.41						15	3.25	.62		15	3.8	.26		12	3.06	.7		12	3.57	.61	
The school participates in community improvement projects	Comm.									15	3.31	.52	5.20***	15	3.61	.36	3.67**	9	3.34	.88	1.66	9	3.82	.44	.88
	Non-Comm.									15	2.33	.39		15	3.24	.33		9	2.83	.59		9	3.63	.31	

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level
*** = .001 level

Table 19

Study Question #6. Interagency Questionnaire

		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school administration meets periodically with my agency/ oryanization to discuss new developments in the community	Comm.	12	3.28	.77	2.35*	13	3.71	.55	1.96
	Non-Comm.	12	2.29	1.13		13	3.13	.90	
My agency/oryanization has sponsored an activity in the school proyram	Comm.	12	3.02	.59	-.63	13	3.44	.56	-.56
	Non-Comm.	12	3.29	1.33		13	3.57	.84	
School personnel let my agency/ oryanization know about new developments in the school	Comm.	12	3.77	.77	2.70*	12	3.84	.50	2.89*
	Non-Comm.	12	2.87	.98		12	3.34	.49	
My agency/oryanization has asked the school for help with services we provide	Comm.	12	3.53	.72	.62	13	3.81	.57	.71
	Non-Comm.	12	3.27	1.19		13	3.57	1.01	
My agency/oryanization utilizes school facilities whenever needed	Comm.	12	3.96	.66	.75	13	4.03	.46	.20
	Non-Comm.	12	3.70	.96		13	3.98	.70	
Community residents have been referred to my agency/ oryanization by the school	Comm.	12	3.59	.45	-.67	13	3.81	.51	-.01
	Non-Comm.	12	3.72	.39		13	3.81	.78	
This school offers activities which involve people of all ayes	Comm.	12	4.63	.41	3.41**	13	4.45	.39	2.96*
	Non-Com.	12	3.39	1.26		13	3.53	1.20	
This school and my agency/ oryanization have jointly pursued a project	Comm.	12	2.96	.55	1.23	13	3.78	.39	1.32
	Non-Comm.	12	2.48	1.17		13	3.35	1.04	
My agency/oryanization has referred residents to an activity offered by the school	Comm.	12	3.35	.74	3.09*	13	3.70	.56	3.16**
	Non-Comm.	12	2.25	1.12		13	2.93	.96	
The school has assisted my agency/oryanization when we have asked for help	Comm.	12	4.05	.46	1.42	13	4.15	.30	1.70
	Non-Comm.	12	3.44	1.30		13	3.67	1.06	
The services of my agency/ oryanization are duplicated by the school proyram	Comm.	12	1.93	.14	.21	12	3.32	.74	-.01
	Non-Comm.	12	1.92	.29		12	3.32	.81	
There is effective communication between the school and my agency/ oryanization	Comm.	12	1.05	.13	-1.28	13	4.57	.26	1.32
	Non-Comm.	12	1.19	.31		13	4.29	.64	

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

School interview data regarding the ways schools cooperate with community agencies are presented in Table 20. Three of the four community schools had direct links with the local Recreation Board; the links varied from strong to weak. One community school had a strong link with the Further Education Council: its Further Education Coordinator worked closely with the community school coordinator to plan and arrange for courses for adults in the school. The same Further Education Coordinator worked closely with the school secretary to arrange for courses in the non-community school. The large urban school boards have their own Further Education Departments that coordinate courses for adults in all their schools.

One community school had worked out an arrangement for sharing personnel whereby a Family and Community Support Services counsellor has an office in the school and spends her time in both personal and career counselling for the students. The Community School Grant pays approximately half the counsellor's salary.

In two non-community schools, organizations wishing to book space had first to ask the principal's permission, then to make booking arrangements through the school board office.

Interviews with agency representatives did not uncover any serious concerns aside from the cost of weekend school building use in urban centres. This issue is discussed in the following chapter. One written-in comment on a questionnaire indicated a need to better communicate about and coordinate school projects with the public library.

There were no differences between the 1982 and 1986 results, except for grade six students who reported a greater level of cooperation of schools with agencies in 1986 (Tables 21 and 22) by responding yes or no to the question, "The school cooperated with community organizations and agencies."

Table 20

Ways Schools Cooperate with Community Agencies Reported in Interviews

	Community (n=4)	Non-Community (n=4)
Direct link with Recreation Board	3	--
Direct link with Further Ed. Council	2	1
Direct link with Community League	1	1
Agency representative on Advisory Council	3	--
Sharing of personnel	1	--
Sharing of physical resources	3	3
One-to-one communications	2	3
Teachers are members of organizations	1	1
Member of Community Groups Council	2	--
Booking for school use is through central office	--	2

Table 21

Study Question #6. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Principals								Teachers							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area	1982	15	5	0	1.47	15	4.67	.62	-.60	15	4.36	.30	-2.28	15	4.45	.26	-.12
	1986	15	4.7	.70		15	4.8	.56		15	4.59	.26		15	4.46	.29	
The school participates in community improvement projects	1982	9	3.33	.87	-.53	9	3.89	1.17	-.24	15	3.16	.5	-2.0	15	3.74	.29	-.43
	1986	11	3.55	.93		11	4	.89		15	3.52	.50		15	3.79	.32	

		Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area	1982	9	3.73	.64	-.07	9	3.60	.47	-.08
	1986	10	3.75	.42		10	3.62	.46	
The school participates in community improvement projects	1982								
	1986								

		Grade Six Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area	1982	6	1.03	.04	-2.28*				
	1986	5	1.19	.17					
The school participates in community improvement projects	1982								
	1986								

		Parents							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area	1982	15	4.13	.38	-.54	15	4.14	.43	-.80
	1986	15	4.21	.42		15	4.24	.26	
The school participates in community improvement projects	1982	15	3.11	.61	-.98	15	3.81	.41	1.40
	1986	15	3.31	.52		15	3.61	.36	

		Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area	1982	14	3.91	.70	-1.49	14	4.06	.43	-1.78
	1986	12	4.30	.63		12	4.39	.52	
The school participates in community improvement projects	1982	14	3.14	.96	-.51	14	3.51	.52	-1.46
	1986	9	3.34	.88		9	3.82	.44	

significance
* = .05 level

Table 22

Study Question #6. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Interagency Questionnaire

		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school administration meets periodically with my agency/ organization to discuss new developments in the community	1982	12	3.57	.6	1.01	12	3.88	.51	.80
	1986	12	3.28	.78		13	3.71	.55	
My agency/organization has sponsored an activity in the school program	1982	11	3.45	.53	1.84	11	3.71	.41	1.33
	1986	12	3.02	.59		13	3.44	.56	
School personnel let my agency/ organization know about new developments in the school	1982	12	4.04	.51	1.03	12	4.14	.5	1.38
	1986	12	3.77	.77		13	3.87	.49	
My agency/organization has asked the school for help with services we provide	1982	12	3.67	.53	.54	12	3.89	.32	.41
	1986	12	3.53	.72		13	3.81	.57	
My agency/organization utilizes school facilities whenever needed	1982	12	3.84	.51	-.49	11	3.89	.47	-.72
	1986	12	3.96	.66		13	4.03	.46	
Community residents have been referred to my agency/ organization by the school	1982	12	3.8	.58	1.01	12	4.15	.41	1.83
	1986	12	3.59	.45		13	3.81	.51	
This school offers activities which involve people of all ages	1982	11	4.59	.43	-.22	11	4.39	.37	-.39
	1986	12	4.63	.41		13	4.45	.39	
This school and my agency/ organization have jointly pursued a project	1982	12	3.21	.58	1.09	12	3.86	.35	.54
	1986	12	2.96	.55		13	3.78	.39	
My agency/organization has referred residents to an activity offered by the school	1982	12	3.42	.5	.28	12	3.58	.36	-.62
	1986	12	3.35	.74		13	3.70	.56	
The school has assisted my agency/organization when we have asked for help	1982	11	3.84	.59	-.94	11	4.13	.53	-1.32
	1986	12	4.05	.46		13	4.15	.30	

Study Question #7 -- Facility Adaptation

This Question addressed the hypothesis that there was no difference between community and non-community schools regarding the design and adaptation of school facilities for community use. Table 23 summarizes the principals' responses to the check lists of design features for community use that apply to their school and of modifications and adaptations for community use that have been made in their school.

Most schools have multi-use areas, kitchens, some form of community room, and a library that are available to the public. In addition, community schools in this survey listed offices for community services, senior citizens' centre and a swimming pool that no non-community school had listed. The difference in overall number of schools reporting some of the seven listed facilities was statistically greater (using a chi-square test) than the number of non-community schools. Community schools reported having made many more modifications to their schools to improve their usefulness to the community than had non-community schools. This difference was also statistically significant, although little information was provided on the types of modifications that were made; some cited small changes such as an additional door or better lighting (Table 24).

School interviews provided the following information regarding the facilities available at schools. Of the four non-community schools, one had neither been originally designed nor later modified to facilitate community use; one had an ancillary room with a tiered floor and a gymnasium with a stage built into it originally; and two had some modifications: a kitchen and stove added to the staff room in one case, and a community use library-shared-computer room in the other.

Table 23

Study Question #7. Facilities Available in Surveyed Schools

Type of Design Feature	Community Schools		Non-Community Schools	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Multi-use area	9	60	2	12.5
Kitchen	11	73.3	7	43.8
Offices for Community Services	8	53.3	0	0
Senior Citizens' Centre	3	20	0	0
Community Room	8	53.3	1	6.3
Swimming Pool	1	6.7	0	0
Library	7	46.7	3	18.8
Type of Modification				
Multi-use area	3	20	1	6.3
Kitchen	6	40	1	6.3
Offices for Community Services	5	33.3	0	0
Senior Citizens' Centre	1	6.7	0	0
Community room	3	20	0	0
Swimming Pool	0	0	0	0
Library	5	33.3	1	6.3

Table 24
Study Question #7. Numbers of Schools Reporting Design Features and Modifications to Facilities

	Design Features		Modifications	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Community Schools	12	2	10	4
Non-community Schools	7	9	2	14
Chi-square =	4.00 *		8.49 *	
Community Schools	Design Features		Modifications	
1982	9	6	10	5
1986	12	2	10	4
Chi-square =	1.28		0.02	

* differences are significant (Chi-square, p=.05)

Adaptations in the community schools were of a more major nature and involved moving showers and change rooms from the gym area to the new outdoor regional swimming pool area in one school, developing community use rooms in the lower level in one school, converting a former classroom to a community use room with kitchen in another school, and modifying the windows and school foyer in another school.

There were no significant differences in the availability of facilities or the modifications to them between 1982 and 1986 in community schools (Table 24).

Study Question #8 -- Community Use of School Facilities

The results of responses to this Question are presented in Table 25. Note that the first question, frequency scale, is a yes/no question, where a yes equals 1 and a no equals 2

The items for this Study Question asked if other people use the school facilities. Teachers, parents, community members and grade 9-12 students all stated that community schools were more heavily used by other groups than were non-community schools. These groups and the principals from community schools attached significantly more importance to such use of schools than did groups from non-community schools although all importance ratings were high.

School interview results regarding the extent of school facility use are presented in Table 26. The community use of schools portion of the Community School Grant accounts for the marked difference in use of schools by the community. The school use grant pays $12 per hour up to 1,540 hours of community use to defray costs for janitorial services, facility supervision, utilities cost and depreciation. Many community schools hire evening and weekend "hosts" to supervise school building use. This part of the grant, worth up to a maximum of $18,480 per year played an important part in making the school accessible to the community. It bought services that assured teachers their classrooms would be in working order when school started in the morning. This was the foremost concern of teachers in both community and non-community schools. The easiest arrangement was the one where the school had rooms the community could use that were not needed for classroom use.

Table 25

Study Question #8. Mean Responses to Questions Regarding Use of School Facilities by Community Groups

		Principals								Teachers								Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school facility is available for community use on an extended time basis daily and yearly	Comm.	14	1	0		14	4.93	.27	10.26^{***}	15	1.01	.04	-4.05^{**}	15	4.47	.28	6.75^{***}								
	Non-Comm.	14	1.07	.27		14	3.64	.50		15	1.14	.12		15	3.66	.28									
Other people, besides teachers and students, use our school	Comm.																	10	4.45	.34	6.25^{***}	10	3.59	.40	8.32^{***}
	Non-Comm.																	10	3.17	.71		10	2.7	.42	

		Grade Six Students								Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school facility is available for community use on an extended time basis daily and yearly	Comm.									15	1.06	.10	-4.12^{**}	15	4.34	.33	4.61^{***}	12	1.03	.08	-3.13^{**}	12	4.15	.45	2.97^{*}
	Non-Comm.									15	1.32	.25		15	3.75	.50		12	1.26	.24		12	3.29	1.19	
Other people, besides teachers and students, use our school	Comm.	5	1.11	.12	.80																				
	Non-Comm.	5	1.04	.09																					

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level
*** = .001 level

Table 26

Extent of School Facility Use Reported in Interviews

	Community (n=4)	Non-Community (n=4)
All day and evening	2	--
Evenings	2	1
Some evenings	--	2
Weekends	4	1
Summer	3	--
Available but used infrequently	--	1

There were no significant differences between the questionnaire responses in 1982 and 1986 on this Study Question (Table 27).

Table 27

Study Question #8. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Principals								Teachers								Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school facility is available for community use on an extended time basis daily and yearly	1982	15	1	0	0.0	15	4.86	.35	-.65	15	1	.01	-.97	15	4.42	.28	-.53								
	1986	15	1	0		15	4.93	.26		15	1.01	.04		15	4.47	.28									
Other people, besides teachers and students, use our school	1982																	9	4.37	.56	-.36	9	3.54	.57	-.22
	1986																	10	4.45	.34		10	3.59	.40	

		Grade Six Students								Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school facility is available for community use on an extended time basis daily and yearly	1982									15	1.03	.06	-.84	15	4.27	.46	-.47	14	1.04	.08	.28	13	4.08	.34	-.82
	1986									15	1.06	.10		15	4.34	.33		12	1.03	.08		13	4.22	.49	
Other people, besides teachers and students, use our school	1982	6	1.02	.03	-1.75																				
	1986	5	1.11	.12																					

Study Question #9 -- Community Issues

One item addressed this Study Question: does the school encourage a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum? The results are shown in Table 28.

Parents associated with community schools had a significantly higher mean score for both frequency and importance than did parents at non-community schools. Principals scored significantly higher on the importance of this issue than did principals from non-community schools.

In 1982 most groups indicated a significant difference between community and non-community schools. It appears that the difference between then and now is that the responses of the non-community school groups has increased more than have those of the community school groups, with the result that there are fewer differences between the two school types in 1986. This could indicate that all schools are placing more emphasis on study of the local community and its problems. Topics such as environmental pollution, physical fitness, or town planning could be included as class projects and could raise the awareness of this issue in any school, whether or not it was a community school.

School interview responses did not enhance the survey results a great deal. Some interviewees responded that the problems and issues were addressed in social studies or with older students. One community school had a school theme with a community focus this year.

There were no significant differences between responses in 1982 and 1986 (Table 29).

Table 28

Study Question #9. Mean Responses to Questions Regarding Study of Community Issues by Students

		Principals								Teachers								Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school encourages a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum	Comm.	14	3.5	.76	2.11	14	4	.68	2.69*	15	2.90	.49	1.49	15	3.42	.29	1.3																
	Non-Comm.	14	2.79	.97		14	3.11	1.04		15	2.68	.38		15	3.26	.42																	
The school encourages a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum	Comm.									15	3.33	.39	3.74**	15	3.77	.24	3.76**	11	3.44	.97	1.75	11	3.89	.81	1.75							
	Non-Comm.									15	2.70	.39		15	3.45	.23		11	2.82	.51		11	3.43	.67									

significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

Table 29

Study Question #9. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Principals								Teachers							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school encourages a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum	1982	15	3.6	.83	.46	15	4.07	.88	.47	15	2.78	.49	-.62	15	3.36	.38	-.46
	1986	15	3.47	.74		15	3.93	.70		15	2.89	.49		15	3.42	.29	

		Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school encourages a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum	1982									15	3.22	.5	-.67	15	3.74	.46	-.23
	1986									15	3.33	.39		15	3.77	.24	

		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school encourages a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum	1982	14	3.13	.55	-1.02	14	3.66	.43	-.91
	1986	11	3.44	.97		11	3.89	.81	

Study Question #10 -- Sense of Community

Four questionnaire items addressed this Study Question. They focussed on the relations and communications that exist between the school and the community. Two of the questions for adults are of the yes/no type for the "frequency" response.

All community school respondent groups reported a significantly higher frequency of school-organized activities that foster cooperative relations with the community than non-community school groups (Table 30). These activities were also rated as more important by community school groups than by non-community school groups.

Parents were the only community school group to report more frequently than the control group that the school makes community members feel welcome at the school, although community school principals and teachers, as well as parents rated it significantly more important than non-community school groups.

Community school teachers, parents and community members were all significantly more likely to report that the present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school. The same groups also considered it significantly more important than non-community school groups.

Grade 9 and 12 students in community schools reported significantly more frequent parent school visits and they considered it significantly more important than did non-community students.

School interview data regarding the ways a school fosters community spirit are summarized in Table 31. The question asked was "How does this school foster community spirit?" It proved a difficult question to answer. All four community schools felt they were and were perceived to be doing specific things to foster community spirit. One

Table 30

Study Question #10. Mean Responses to Questions Regarding Attitudes Between School and Community

		Principals								Teachers							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community	Comm.	10	4.5	.71	3.31**	10	4.6	.70	3.09*	15	4.10	.43	6.51***	15	4.22	.27	4.51***
	Non-Comm.	10	3	.94		10	3.4	.70		15	3.25	.43		15	3.69	.43	
The school makes community members feel welcome at the school	Comm.	14	1	0	0.0	14	4.93	.28	2.86*	15	1.01	.24	-1.06	15	4.62	.25	2.39*
	Non-Comm.	14	1	0		14	4.29	.73		15	1.03	.07		15	4.36	.31	
The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school	Comm.	14	1	0	0.0	14	4.79	.43	2.04	15	1.02	.43	-4.08**	15	4.52	.3	3.12**
	Non-Comm.	14	1.11	.29		14	4.14	.82		15	1.19	.16		15	4.07	.49	
My parents come to visit the school	Comm.																
	Non-Comm.																

		Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The school makes community members feel welcome at the school	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
My parents come to visit the school	Comm.	10	3.36	.41	7.64***	10	3.59	.38	3.68**
	Non-Comm.	10	2.35	.32		10	2.94	.51	

		Grade Six Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The school makes community members feel welcome at the school	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								
My parents come to visit the school	Comm.	5	1.11	.12	.80				
	Non-Comm.	5	1.04	.09					

		Parents							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community	Comm.	15	3.75	.49	6.44***	15	3.91	.32	5.55***
	Non-Comm.	15	2.70	.42		15	3.45	.23	
The school makes community members feel welcome at the school	Comm.	15	1.02	.04	-2.67*	15	4.58	.22	5.68***
	Non-Comm.	15	1.08	.08		15	4.2	.31	
The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school	Comm.	15	1.04	.07	-4.05**	15	4.50	.27	4.36***
	Non-Comm.	15	1.25	.20		15	4.15	.33	
My parents come to visit the school	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								

		Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community	Comm.	12	3.70	.80	3.13**	12	4.0	.48	2.34*
	Non-Comm.	12	2.97	.53		12	3.55	.52	
The school makes community members feel welcome at the school	Comm.	12	1.01	.04	-2.01	12	4.38	.59	1.81
	Non-Comm.	12	1.15	.25		12	3.67	1.30	
The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school	Comm.	12	1.01	.05	-3.43**	12	4.51	.43	3.07*
	Non-Comm.	12	1.22	.24		12	3.44	1.16	
My parents come to visit the school	Comm.								
	Non-Comm.								

Significance
* = .05 level
** = .01 level
*** = .001 level

of the non-community schools was spoken of highly as fostering community spirit; two were not seen to be fostering community spirit particularly either by staff or community--both of these communities had halls where activities were held; one non-community school did have special events that community people attended and limited facility use but community people wanted more involvement than currently existed.

Table 31

The Ways a School Fosters Community Spirit According to Interviewees

	Community (n=4)	Non-Community (n=4)
Special events	3	1
Facility use	3	1
Participation in community projects	2	--
School has always been the centre of the community	1	--
Cooperation with Community League	--	1
Advertising community events	--	1

The differences between the 1986 and 1982 results were not great (Table 32). Principals now report that community schools do significantly more to foster cooperative relations with the community, and community members attach significantly more importance to relations with the school than they did in 1982.

Table 32

Study Question #10. Comparison of 1982 and 1986 Mean Responses

		Principals								Teachers								Grade Nine and Twelve Students							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community	1982	15	3.93	.7	-2.46*	15	4.2	.94	-1.46	15	4.02	.44	-.53	15	4.14	.3	-.81								
	1986	12	4.58	.67		12	4.67	.65		15	4.10	.43		15	4.22	.27									
The school makes community members feel welcome at the school	1982	15	1	0	00	15	4.87	.35	-.56	15	1	.03	-.92	15	4.5	.27	-1.30								
	1986	15	1	0		15	4.93	.26		15	1.01	.02		15	4.62	.25									
The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school	1982	15	1	0	00	14	4.57	.51	-1.34	15	1.07	.11	1.79	15	4.43	.19	-1.01								
	1986	15	1	0		15	4.8	.41		15	1.01	.04		15	4.52	.3									
My parents come to visit the school	1982																	9	2.18	.41	-1.81	9	2.97	.52	.88
	1986																	10	2.59	.55		10	2.78	.43	

		Grade Six Students								Parents								Community Members							
		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)				Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	x̄	s	t	n	x	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t	n	x̄	s	t
The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community	1982									15	3.65	.47	-.56	15	3.91	.39	-.03	14	3.42	.6	-.99	14	3.59	.43	-2.31*
	1986									15	3.75	.49		15	3.91	.32		12	3.69	.80		12	4.00	.48	
The school makes community members feel welcome at the school	1982									15	1.01	.02	-.83	15	4.41	.36	-1.60	14	1.01	.05	-.02	13	4.24	.48	-.90
	1986									15	1.02	.043		15	4.58	.22		12	1.01	.04		13	4.43	.59	
The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school	1982									15	1.11	.14	1.76	15	4.36	.37	-1.19	14	1.12	.12	2.87	13	4.17	.51	-2.06*
	1986									15	1.04	.07		15	4.50	.27		12	1.01	.05		13	4.55	.43	
My parents come to visit the school	1982	6	1.1	.09	.17																				
	1986	5	1.09	.09																					

significance
* = .05 level

Community School Coordinators

Comparison of the responses of Community School Coordinators in 1982 and 1986 indicated significant differences on only two frequency items (Table 33). In 1986 scores were higher for the question of use of human community resources to enhance the school curriculum (Item 1) and the involvement of parents in advising on the school curriculum (Item 5). In addition, in 1986 the scores on the Importance scale were higher than in 1982 for the questions of School Board encouragement of teachers in school district decision-making (Item 9), and of the school providing educational activities for people of all ages (Item 13).

Table 33
Mean Responses of Community School Coordinators, and Comparison with 1982 Responses

		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school uses human community resources to enhance the school curriculum	1986	12	4.18	.12	-8.56**	12	4.46	.16	-.50
	1982	13	4.92	.28		13	4.54	.52	
Students go into the community to use available facilities and resources	1986	12	4.42	.79	-.45	12	4.33	.49	.53
	1982	13	4.54	.52		13	4.23	.44	
Students go into the community to provide community service while they learn	1986	12	3.58	1.08	.10	12	4.	.85	1.28
	1982	13	3.54	1.05		13	3.62	.65	
The school emphasizes the study of the local community	1986	12	3.92	.79	-.79	12	4.17	.84	-.47
	1982	13	4.15	.69		13	4.31	.63	
The school involves parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	1986	12	2.92	.67	-2.08*	12	3.83	.72	.67
	1982	13	3.62	.96		13	3.62	.87	
The school involves parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	1986	12	4.67	.89	.35	12	4.5	.67	.32
	1982	13	4.54	.97		13	4.46	.78	
The school involves community members other than parents in providing advice on the school curriculum	1986	12	2.58	1.24	-1.99	12	3.50	1	.13
	1982	13	3.46	.97		13	3.54	.52	
The school involves community members other than parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	1986	12	3.92	1	-.69	12	3.92	.90	-.79
	1982	12	4.16	.72		13	4.15	.55	
The school board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making	1986	12	2.67	1.37	-.38	12	4.42	.52	2.12*
	1982	13	2.85	.90		13	3.92	.64	
The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making	1986	12	4.83	.04	1.52	12	4.83	.39	.36
	1982	13	4.54	.66		13	4.77	.44	
The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages	1986	12	5.	0	2.06	12	4.92	.29	2.24*
	1982	13	4.54	.78		13	4.54	.52	
The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel	1986	12	4.25	.87	-.69	12	4.33	.65	-.24
	1982	13	4.46	.66		13	4.38	.51	

Table 33 (continued)

Mean Responses of Community School Coordinators, and Comparison with 1982 Responses

		Frequency Scale (1-5)				Importance Scale (1-5)			
		n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t
The school staff includes students as resource personnel	1986	12	3.92	1.17	.55	12	4.17	.94	.29
	1982	13	3.69	.85		13	4.08	.64	
The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area	1986	12	4.83	.39	.78	12	4.75	.45	.70
	1982	13	4.69	.48		13	4.62	.51	
The school participates in community improvement projects	1986	12	3.8	.92	1.02	12	4.36	.67	1.58
	1982	12	3.38	1.11		12	3.83	.94	
The school facility is available for community use on an extended time basis daily and yearly	1986	12	1	1	0	12	4.64	.51	-.56
	1982	13	1	0		12	4.75	.45	
The school encourages a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum	1986	12	3.56	1.29	-1.62	12	4.33	.65	.73
	1982	13	4.23	.73		13	4.15	.55	
The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community	1986	12	4.42	.79	.11	12	4.67	.49	1.03
	1982	13	4.38	.77		13	4.46	.52	
The school makes community members feel welcome at the school	1986	12	1	0	0	12	4.91	.30	-.06
	1982	13	1	0		12	4.92	.29	
The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school	1986	12	1	0	0	12	4.73	.47	-.59
	1982	13	1	0		12	4.83	.39	

Correlations of Group Response and School Enrollment

Correlation coefficients (Table 34) were used to identify any relationships that may exist between the responses of community school groups and the enrollments in the schools. Only a few of the many combinations proved to be correlated; this was the case in the 1982 study also.

Teachers' responses to questions four and five were negatively correlated with school enrollment. That is, in the larger schools teachers reported emphasizing study of local community less (Item 4) and to involving parents less in advising on the school curriculum (Item 5) than did teachers in the smaller schools. Also, perhaps not surprisingly, teachers in the larger schools concluded that principals did not encourage teacher participation in decision-making as much as did principals in smaller schools (Item 10).

Parents of students at larger community schools also felt that the schools did not emphasize study of the local community as much as did parents associated with smaller schools (Item 4). In addition, these parents felt that the larger schools did not involve community members other that parents in advising on curriculum as much as did the smaller schools (Item 7).

The grade 9-12 students indicated a negative correlation with school size on the question of going on field trips (Item 2). Students in the larger schools, more than in the smaller ones, indicated that they felt the school cooperated with community organizations (Item 10), that other people used the school (Item 13), that they helped students in their own classes (Item 15), and that they helped students in other classes (Item 16).

Principals' responses indicated positive correlations with enrollment on three items. Principals at the larger schools felt that

Table 34

Correlation Coefficients and Significance

of Frequency Response Means with School Enrollment

Question	Principal	Teacher	Grade 9-12	Parent
1	-.229	-.187	-.313	-.039
2	.385	-.295	-.691 *	.065
3	.532 *	.07	.246	.354
4	.349	-.606 *	.167	-.641 *
5	.222	-.6 *	-.416	-.521
6	.034	-.539	-.05	-.475
7	.545 *	-.257	.623	-.586 *
8	.522 *	-.523	.361	-.382
9	-.148	.13	.459	-.476
10	.038	-.582 *	.841 *	-.297
11	-.085	-.488	.372	-.427
12	-.259	-.039	-.596	-.171
13	.264	-.082	.79 *	.052
14	.061	-.392	-.247	-.155
15	-.143	-.346	.689 *	-.263
16	.198	-.287	.876 *	-.209
17	.19	-.303	.18	-.138

* significance at p=.05

the students went into the community to provide community service more, (Item 3), that the schools involved community members other than parents in advising on curriculum more (Item 7), and that community members other than parents assisted teachers more (Item 8) than did principals at smaller schools. This result was in direct disagreement with the responses of parents, students and teachers, who felt that the larger schools did not involve students in the local activities or involve community members in school decisions.

In the 1982 study, negative correlations were also found, indicating that there was less parent and community member involvement at the larger schools. In that study the principals agreed with the parents and teachers.

Comparison of Group Response and Year School Obtained Charter

A comparison of mean survey responses to year the school obtained its charter was carried out on principals', teachers' and parents' ratings of frequency and importance of items. Five schools had obtained their charter in 1980, three in 1981, and seven in 1982. Where differences occurred, internal differences were greater than differences between 1980 and 1982. The three schools with the 1981 charters tended to have either higher or lower means than the 1980 or 1982 schools where there were differences at all. However, the small number of schools in the sample with 1981 charters made their mean most subject to influences of extremes. No conclusions were drawn concerning responses of principals, teachers or parents in relation to year the school obtained its community school charter.

Summary of Findings

Written survey responses were completed by a cross-section of the school community including principals, community school coordinators, teachers, inter-agency representatives, parents, community members and students and t-tests conducted on group mean responses for each school.Significant differences were reported between community and non-community schools on questions related to eight of the ten community school dimensions.

The following aspects were reported significantly more often in community schools than in non-community schools by at least three respondent groups:

* community related curriculum
* involvement of parents and community members as volunteers and in providing advice on the school curriculum, although the latter happened less frequently than the former
* educational activities for people of all ages
* involvement of community adults as resource personnel; inconsistent reports on use of students as resource people
* communication between school administration and community organizations and agencies regarding new developments in the school and referrals of residents to school activities
* design features and building modifications that would enhance community school operation (principals were the sole respondents)
* extended time availability of school for community use
* school-organized activities that foster cooperative relations with the community and likelihood that the school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school.

There were no significant differences between community and non-

community schools on the following:

- involvement of teachers by the school board or school administration in decision-making or involvement of students by the teachers in asking for ideas on how the school could be better
- participation of students with people of all ages in educational activities
- agencies sponsoring activities in the school program, agencies asking the school for help with services provided, agencies using school facilities whenever needed, referral of community residents to agencies by the school, jointly pursuing a project with the school, assistance from school by agency when asked for help, duplication of agency services by the school, or effective communication between school and agency
- study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum (according to most groups)
- making community members feel welcome at the school (according to most groups).

Size of community school was found to correlate significantly with a few factors: according to students, the larger the school the more cooperation with community organizations, the more other people used the school, and the more students served as resource persons; according to teachers and parents, the larger the school, the less study of the local community was emphasized and the less likelihood there was of parents or community members advising on the school curriculum.

Comparisons between length of time a community school held its charter and mean group questionnaire responses indicated greater internal than overall differences.

A comparison of responses from community school groups in 1986 and 1982 on 143 frequency items indicated significant differences as follows:

.. teachers, community school coordinators and community members reported more frequent study of the local community in 1986

.. teachers reported an increase in volunteer help from community members and parents in 1986

.. teachers reported more use of students as resource personnel in 1986

.. community members reported community adults were used more frequently as school resource personnel in 1986

.. principals reported more activities to foster community relations in 1986

ANALYSIS OF 1986 RESEARCH QUESTION DATA

Responses to interview and survey questions addressing the 1986 research questions are presented and discussed in this chapter. Documents related to the community school program are also quoted.

Assessment of Interdepartmental Community School Committee (IDCSC)

Data sources for the assessment included interviews with each of the Committee members, questions asked of the Assistant Deputy Ministers, School Board Representatives, Community School Principals, and Community School Friends. The Terms of Reference for the Committee as included in Document #35R2 were reviewed as well as the Minutes of the Committee from 1982 to the present.

Terms of Reference for the IDCSC

There are eight Terms of Reference for the Committee. Briefly, four of these define membership (one representative from each of the four departments: Education, Advanced Education, Recreation and Parks, and Culture; the Chairman to be initially the Education representative) and approval of motions (one vote per department; simple majority to carry motions; motions without unanimous support to be forwarded to a meeting of Departmental Deputy Ministers).

The remaining four terms define areas of responsibility:

- approve the establishment, financing, functioning and modification of community school programs

- recommend research
- carry out other activities (information service
  consultation service
  inservice education
  preservice
  educational and community school building
  specifications)
- employ an Executive Director and other staff to assist the Committee to carry out its functions.

Committee Membership

Although there has been some turnover in department members on the Committee, the same person (Education representative) has chaired the Committee since it was officially struck. There was limited interest among those interviewed in rotating the chairmanship among departments.

There has been one Executive Director for the program since the program's inception. The Executive Director reports to the Director of Support Programs (who is also the IDCSC Chairman) in terms of organization within the Department of Education.

Committee Activities

A.Approval of Charters

The major activity of the Committee since funding for schools became available in 1980 has been approval of community school charters. The charter defines the school's proposed activities, staffing and budget. Since most of the charters were approved in the first three years from 1980 to 1983, those were the busiest years for

the Committee. Once additional funds for approving further schools slowed to a virtual stop, the Committee discontinued its monthly meetings. In 1984 and 1985 it met twice a year.

B.Evaluations

There are three kinds of evaluations that involve the schools directly and the Committee either directly or indirectly. These are Year-End Evaluations, Self-Help Evaluations and Mini-Evaluations.

Community schools are required to conduct Year-End Evaluations based on their objectives for the year. These evaluations are submitted to the IDCSC which originally passed them on to its Evaluation Sub-Committee. (The Evalution Sub-Committee is made up of each of the four departments' alternates to the IDCSC. The Executive Director is elected to chair the Committee. The Sub-Committee last met in February 1985.) The last two years, the Year-End Evaluations have been reviewed by Community School Friends.

Schools can request that a Friend conduct an informatl evaluation of their program (called a Self-Help Evaluation). The evaluation results are given only to the school.

It was the original understanding in the #35R2 Working Paper Document (April, 1983) Appendix D Guideline Criteria for Designated Community Schools that the IDCSC would "arrange for an independent evaluation of the Community School Policy, Principles and Procedures in the fourth year of the program (1983-84)." Since approval for the evaluation was not forthcoming until the year of this study (1985-86), and since schools were granted an original agreement of five years' support, the Executive Director developed a system of "Mini-Evaluations" to be carried out in the fifth year of grant support for Community Schools. The Mini-Evaluations were mandated by the Minister

before extensions were granted.

At the March 1985 IDCSC meeting it appears from the Minutes that a decision was made to conduct Mini-Evaluations on the first 11 designated schools. At the June 1985 meeting a vote was taken to provide extensions to these schools to 1987. No discussion of methodology for conducting the evaluations was recorded in the Minutes. The handbook provided to regional office staff in the fall of 1985 is entitled "Approved Mini Evaluation Process Based on Spring 1985 Evaluation of 11 Designated Schools."

The present IDCSC member and the past alternate member from Recreation and Parks have assisted with the Mini-Evaluations (30 of which were scheduled for 1985-86). The teams have otherwise been made up of regional office staff and Community School Friends. One urban school board had a representative on the visiting teams as well. The interview instruments included those developed for the 1982 Lazaruk study. It is not clear how the Mini-Evaluations were supposed to be integrated with the current study since the Mini-Evaluations were designed as an interim measure until such time as an external evaluation was conducted.

C.Consultation Service

This activity along with the other four following activities are left to the Executive Director to carry out on behalf of the IDCSC. The consultation service consists of assistance from three sources: the Executive Director, consultants in regional offices of Alberta Education, and Community School Friends.

The consultation service provided to schools by the Executive Director is ongoing from the time a school or school community shows interest in the program. The Executive Director is the embodiment of

the Community School Program as far as schools are concerned. Most school staff have little or no knowledge of the role of the IDCSC. The Executive Director reviews a school's charter, provides editorial comments to the school and decides when the charter is ready to present to the IDCSC. The Executive Director represented the schools who obtained their charters in 1980, 1981 and some in 1982 before the Committee. The Executive Director visits schools on an informal basis and responds to queries from schools about program operation.

Regional office staff are involved with community schools in the course of their normal consultation services and serve as chairpersons of the Mini-Evaluations. Regional offices of Alberta Education are also the avenue to any corrective action that requires formal measures, although such a route has never been taken.

Community School Friends are selected and arrangements are made for their employment by the Executive Director. There are currently 43 listed of which about half are community school principals, 7 hold community school positions and the others are associated with school boards, colleges, government departments or are private citizens. A Friend is assigned to a new school that is in the process of developing a charter. Friends are assigned to community schools who request a confidential Self-Evaluation. Friends also are included in the Mini-Evaluation teams. Friends working on contract receive an honorarium of $110 per day plus expenses and a substitute is hired to replace them.

D.Information Service

The principal information service used to be the publication, "Linkage." Rather than continuing the separate publication, the Executive Director has now been invited to contribute to a departmental publication. Many people reported missing the former publication.

E.Inservice Education

Inservice Education is provided through workshops organized and presented by the Executive Director as well as by Committee members. The Committee also supports the annual conference of the Community Education Association of Alberta.

F.Preservice Education

Preservice Education was originally directed to the undergraduate level of Education. An Advanced Educational Liaison Committee was formed to address this concern and chaired by the Advanced Education member to the IDCSC. That committee has written some papers but has not met often. Further to the Preservice Education activity, the Executive Director teaches a summer course at University of Lethbridge.

G.Education and Community School Building Specifications

Building Specifications were addressed by a consultant's study whose report was accepted in 1982.

Executive Director Position in Terms of the IDCSC

The Executive Director Position is a full-time position reporting to the IDCSC. Funds for this position come from Alberta Education.

The Executive Director conducts the day-to-day business of the Program with three office assistants. The Executive Director is not a member of the IDCSC. He prepares the agenda and minutes as well as an Executive Director's Report for each meeting.

The Executive Director makes operational decisions but does not set policy. However, he does make policy suggestions to the Committee for their consideration. Approval for grants to the community schools is given by the IDCSC. Expenses related to the Executive Director's office and contracts with Friends do not go to the Committee for approval. The budget for Mini-Evaluations of 30 schools in 1985-86 was $80,000. and this budget item, for example, was not reported in the IDCSC Minutes as having been presented to the IDCSC for approval.

Although the Executive Director reports to the IDCSC, the Committee does not, in fact, give approval on major issues such as the shift in responsibility to allot half of the Executive Director's time to school extension developments. The position is evaluated for annual staff evaluation purposes by the Director of Support Programs. The Director (and Committee Chairman) consulted with the Committee as part of the annual evaluation in March 1983. Such a consultation has not been reported in the minutes since. The position, therefore, does have strong ties to Alberta Education. Committee members recognize this.

Initiative for action regarding the Community School Program is reported to come from the Executive Director by those on the Committee. From comparing the Executive Director's Report to the Minutes of each Committee meeting it would appear that far more initiatives are suggested by the Executive Director than are followed up on by the Committee. However the minutes do not clarify the Committee's position on those issues that are not pursued.

Concern was expressed by the Executive Director in his report to the Committee in March 1985 about principals filling the role of Curriculum Coordinator in 12 schools. The Minutes contain no discussion of the issue. However, one committee member voiced the same concern when interviewed for this study. The Committee has been slow to take action on matters other than charter approval. This slow pace is attributed by some Committee members to the funding freeze on the

program. One Committee member suggested having some representatives from community schools on the Committee and rotating them from year to year.

Perceptions of the IDCSC

A.School Board Representatives

The majority had little or no perception of the Committee. The following comments were each made by one respondent only:

1) The respondent had limited perception of the Committee but saw it as supportive of local initiative

2) The Committee is dedicated, competent and committed to the Community School concept. Somewhat too controlling about where funds are spent -- more flexibility is desirable.

3) The Committee was slow to recognize that the local school board is an integral partner.

4) The Committee is too far removed to be effective.

5) The Committee is cooperative, willing to listen, helpful and supportive to schools while fighting between departments at the planning level. The Program should be under the control of Alberta Education. The current arrangement causes confusion to the school as to who is calling the shots. Currently somewhat heavy handed.

B.Community School Principals

In terms of presenting the charter to the Committee for approval, five principals felt the hearing was fair, five were not principal of the school at the time of approval or did not respond and three said their school had no formal hearing.

The following perceptions of the IDCSC were reported by only one

principal unless noted otherwise:

1) Committee has a high profile (n=2)
2) Committee is friendly
3) The Committee is seen as monitoring and the principal believes review should be left to the local school board
4) The school is responsible to the local school board first
5) The Committee expects too much similarity from school to school that does not allow for the school to build on the local situation (n=2)
6) There is too much reporting back for the size of the grant
7) There are some difficulties interpreting community schools with different departments. Either Recreation or Further Education takes informal leadership. It could hurt the school if there is no strong leadership at the school level on start up of the committee (that draws up the charter).

C.Community School Friends

The following comments on the perception of the IDCSC Committee were each made by one respondent:

1) Many good ideas come from the group. They are helpful to school operations
2) The Executive Director does an excellent job of informing everyone involved in the community school initiative
3) The Committee is remote. The Executive Director is contacted for requests
4) The Committee is highly organized and committed. The driving force behind the movement is the energy and drive of the Executive Director.

Suggestions from Community School Friends for improving the functioning or purposes of the Committee were as follows:

1) Condense the Community School Friends Handbook
2) Heighten visibility by being seen to lobby for changes the

Committee supports

3) Implement a merit basis for selecting and continuing the funding to Community Schools

4) Cut down on the paper blizzard. The respondent receives three copies of everything.

Support to the Program from Member Departments

The following information on support to the Program from member departments was collected from Assistant Deputy Ministers and IDCSC members.

All administrative expenditures and grants come out of the Education budget (including the Executive Director position, the Community School Grants and contracts with Community School Friends).

The other three departments all contribute indirect support. In the past, Recreation and Parks had a Community School Incentive Program and played a major role in paying for building renovations. The grant is now called the Community Recreation Culture Grant Program and is supported by both departments named. Community schools are no longer directly specified but are eligible. Two schools in the study had local Recreation Board staff doing programming in their schools before the Community School Program began. Community schools that become members of Further Education Councils can access program grants from them or can request that the Further Education Council Coordinator organize the adult programming for their school. Alberta Culture staff make a point of visiting community schools but do not give them special treatment; Recreation and Parks, on the other hand, has more of a role with community schools than with other schools.

Alberta Education sees itself as having a leadership role, a guidance role, a monitoring role. Alberta Recreation and Parks sees

itself as having an active supportive role and is involved in decision-making. It particularly supports the multi-use of schools philosophy. Alberta Advanced Education sees its role as cooperative and supportive, involved in decision-making. Alberta Culture sees its role with schools at the local level and at the provincial level, involvement with IDCSC and some sub-committees.

Guidelines and Procedures for Approving Community Schools

The following cross-section of people were asked or volunteered their opinions on the guidelines and procedures for approving community schools: Assistant Deputy Ministers, School Board Representatives, Community School Friends and Community School Principals.

A.Current Procedures

The current procedure for a school to become a community school is for interested school communities to meet with the Executive Director, acquire a package of materials, acquire a Community School Friend, work through a committee structure and develop a charter which is presented to the IDCSC for approval and funding, if available.

A handbook to assist Community School Friends in helping a school prepare their charter has been developed. One Friend recommended a similar handbook be made available to principals and advisory committees.

A sample charter is now made available to schools. It was developed throughout 1981 by the New Sarepta Community High School and the Executive Director sat on the Steering Committee, served as the Friend and sat on the editorial committee. This sample is 94 pages long and is short compared to many charters that have been developed.

Most people involved in the charter process believe it serves a useful purpose in developing liaison with agencies, working out plans for implementation, and developing a cooperative spirit between school and community members. It is not unusual for schools who are already operating as a community school by their own understanding to decide to apply for the grant.

The sequence a school follows in the charter development is included in Working Document #35R2 April 1983 under Appendix D Guideline Criteria for Designated Schools and IDCSC Designation Considerations. Included as Step 2 is the criterion that Municipal Council agrees by resolution to support the establishment and functioning of the community school. Representatives from boards in both the major cities indicated that this requirement should be dropped for major urban centres. One rural superintendent also suggested the requirement be dropped.

An alternative to the provision of guidelines for approving community schools was suggested by one school board representative. The alternative was to indicate the results considered desirable and to leave the process to achieve the results up to the local level.

The information sheet on the grant indicates that a School Board or Municipality may consult with the IDCSC if they wish to "propose alternate criteria, considerations and grant provisions." One of the major urban school boards did pursue this route but their proposal to request that allocation of funds be to the school board for programs to support community school concepts in all schools rather than funding a few specific schools did not meet with the approval of the IDCSC.

The teeth, so to speak, in the Guidelines come from the nature of the support grants which provide for:

1)leadership positions - community liaison (up to $13,300 for 3/8 to 1/2 time)

- curriculum and professional development (same as above)
- further education and career orientation ($6,650 for 1/4 to 1/2 time)

2)administration
- secretary (to a maximum of $16,750)
- building use (to a maximum of $18,480)

3)small (flexibility) grant to the school to a maximum of $5,000.

The total funds available per school are $73,480.

B.Perceptions of Guidelines and Procedures

Most school board representatives indicated streamlining and simplifying of the procedures for gaining approval would be desirable. One respondent from this group questioned the validity of the "challenge" of the charter and the perception that was created in their case of it being "threatening." One respondent requested that "monies needed to put procedures into place should be provided." One respondent indicated that writing standards for the charter may be too high for schools with a high need level but a low level of written communication skills among the community preparing the charter. An example was cited of one such school being discouraged from completing its charter application by the rewrites requested. In this case, the community did not want the principal to do the writing for them.

Four principals thought procedures should be streamlined and simplified, four did not (they felt the process was important), and the remainder did not comment. The only specific suggestions for streamlining were to reduce the amount of paperwork.

One Friend thought the procedures for gaining approval could be streamlined to reduce the "red tape." Two thought the effort was necessary for those involved to learn their role and to prove their interest. One Friend thought funding guidelines should state those

alternatives that are acceptable since there is a lot of interpretation leeway permitted. The reference was specifically to the community school positions. The respondent believed the current funding guidelines could lead to misuse of some of the funds. One Friend recommended that new schools be evaluated upon charter application to provide a basis for funding the most worthy and to indicate areas for growth in schools whose charters are approved.

Impact of the Alberta Community School Program Position (ACSPP)

The ACSPP is presented in the Working Paper Document #35R2 as a 5-page statement with six appendices. The opening statement defines a community school, states the position that the provincial government endorses the community school concept and will assist in local implementation and operation, presents 13 principles of implementation and 7 points about community education. Details of procedures are presented in the appendices.

Questions concerning the impact of the ACSPP were put to School Board Representatives, Community School Principals, coordinators and teachers.

In terms of effect on school board policy, one school board representative indicated the concept fit well into the Catholic/Christian philosophy of Home/School/Parish. The Calgary Board of Education has had a community school policy since April, 1977. The Edmonton Public Board of Trustees has passed policies to support parent involvement in the education of their children and community involvement in the schools (considered a separate, parallel development to the IDCSC community school concept). Six school board representatives indicated their boards endorsed the concept and five boards had reflected their support in policies and expanded operations. On the other hand, one response indicated the community school concept

had had little or no effect on school board policy, and one indicated it had little effect except to encourage the use of school facilities by the public.

The impact of the program on staff and community as judged by school board representatives and principals is presented in Table 35. These were volunteered answers in response to the open-ended question.

A specific question was asked about the extent to which the program affects the teachers' extra-curricular load. Teachers at two out of three schools said the extra-curricular load was not affected much since the coordinator or community members do the additional work. At one school, teachers said careful booking in advance was required and more time was required for inventorying equipment; however, they appreciated the school being open on Sunday.

Six principals perceived increased extra-curricular workload for teachers and seven did not. Four school board representatives perceived increased extra-curricular workloads for their teachers.

The perceived effect of the community school concept on completion of diploma requirements is summarized in Table 36. The majority saw no effect. One school board representative noted that the concept made it more feasible for adult students to complete diploma courses or programs.

Many principals indicated the question did not apply to lower grades. Those who saw a positive effect referred to the program enhancing completion of requirements, "developing well rounded students that will like and complete high school," and "opening up opportunities for special projects and work experience for special needs students."

Table 35

Impact of the Community School Program on Staff and Community

Impact	School Board Representatives	Principals
Positive	5	2
Increased time commitment	1	2
Increased communication	1	---
Increased awareness of school program	1	1
Agencies/parents more involved in schools	2	3
Broadened view of education	1	---
Builds feeling of community	2	3
Mixed support from staff	1	---
More work for secretaries & caretakers	1	4
More inconvenience for teachers	---	---
Have to be flexible about use of space	---	2
Use of facilities is stressful	---	1
More cooperation between home and school	---	1
Increased pressure on staff to participate in community	---	1
Additional staff gives flexibility	---	1

Table 36
Effect of the Community School Concept
on Completion of Diploma Requirements

Effect	School Board Rep's	Principals
Positive	1	3
Negative	1	---
None	8	10
No answer	1	---

Community School Leadership Positions

The granting structure for calculating community school grants identifies three leadership elements, referred to here as positions: Curriculum Coordinator, Community School Coordinator, and Further Education Coordinator.

The role of the Curriculum Coordinator (Community School Curricular and Professional Development Element) includes the following:

Facilitating or administering

a.study of the community in the community
b.work experience
c.work study
d.educational community service
e.use of community resource people and materials in the classroom
f.adult credit programs
g.adult basic literacy programs
h.educational activities involving heterogeneous age groupings

i.across age student tutoring
j.parental curricular advice
k.study of significant community problems or issues
l.collegially based teaching improvement processes
m.curriculum related school administrative functions
in order to encourage and help teachers in developing and implementing community school curriculum.

The role of the Community School Coordinator (School/Community Liaison Element) includes the following:
a.facilitating or administering effective cooperation and liaison between the school, its teachers and other community agencies and the community at large
b.developing and supervising implementation of policies and procedures for community use of school facilities and resources. This might include initiatives to modify the facilities for community use
c.developing and administering a community/school volunteers program.

The role of Further Education Coordinator (Further Education and Career Orientation Element) includes the following:
a.encourage programming by the school in the further education field and facilitate such programming in school facilities by other community agencies through cooperative arrangements with the School Board
b.provide information to adults and young people in the community on career possibilities and training programs and to act as a referral agent to Alberta Career Centres
c.facilitate the inclusion of a career element in the school's counselling capability.
(The position description acknowledges that this role may be filled by a Further Education Council Coordinator in which case Community School grant funds would not be available.)

The time and salary supported for each of the positions was indicated earlier. The grant supports .7 of the leadership positions

up to the maximum dollar figure.

The Further Education Coordinator position is only listed as a separate position in one out of the 67 schools on the December 1985 Community School list (and in that case the position is combined with an evening hostess position.) The Further Education Coordinator position is often combined with the Community School Coordinator position to produce a full-time position but the position is still referred to as the Community School Coordinator.

The Curriculum Coordinator position is usually filled by either one person half-time or a combination of teaching staff and/or the principal to equal .5 of a staff position. At one school visited in this study, the Curriculum Coordinator up until this school year has been the superintendent; this year the position has been unfilled.

At many Community schools a certain percentage of the principal's time is allotted to a coordinating position. Such an arrangement leaves the coordinating position responsible to the person holding the position. Given the variety of demands on a school principal's time, it would be difficult to protect the portion of time assigned to the coordinating role to actually carrying out that role.

Of the three positions, the Community School Coordinator position (half-time) is the one with least overlap with services offered by or accessible from others. The Curriculum Coordinator position includes many responsibilities of classroom teachers and division or department heads as well as overlapping the Further Education Coordinator's responsibilities. The Further Education position responsibilities can be largely accessed through the Local Further Education Council and/or the local Recreation Department. In large urban systems Further Education is organized on a system-wide scale by the central office.

In terms of the role community school principals reported holding

in the school, four held coordinating positions or parts thereof, six saw themselves overseeing the program or organizing the structure, one requested a definition of what the leadership role should be and two did not respond. Community school operation was estimated to take between 5 and 30 percent of the principal's week (for those who attached a number to their time estimate).

Teachers at two schools said little or nothing would change in the time they spend on their community school role if the school did not receive grants; teachers at one school said they would spend more time arranging school trips.

All five teachers in one group interview agreed that the program was more for the community than for the students. They were not sure that the situation was good. They felt pressure was on them to "put on a good show" but that substance was lacking. Teachers in this group were drawn randomly and respresented a wide range of grades.

At another school the teachers said they were doing "community things" before they became a community school.

One obvious difference between community and non-community schools is in the use of adult volunteers by teachers. The practice is much more prevalent in community schools than in non-community schools.

Alternatives to the Community School Definition

School board representatives and school staff were asked if they saw any possible alternative to the Community School definition. Six school board representatives saw no alternative to the current definition. Two suggested a change to "every school a community school." One recommended reducing the 10 characteristics to six. Two suggested the criteria be more flexible to allow schools to respond to

their own community and stakeholder interests. One suggested conducting a review in terms of 1) the amount the curriculum should be oriented towards the community; 2) staff and student involvement in interagency activities; and 3) study of local issues.

Twelve principals saw no alternative to the current definition. One recommended the dimensions not be numbered because the numbers inferred relative importance.

Alternatives to the Community School Educational Mode

School Board Representatives and school staff were asked if they knew of any other programs that accomplished some of the same results as the Community School Program. Most respondents mentioned other programs that accomplished some of the same results as the Community School Program although no other program focused on exactly the same 10 dimensions. Aside from non-funded schools, other suggestions included the Early Childhood Services Program, Recreation and Parks programs, Boys and Girls Clubs, Family and Community Support Services, Continuing Education, the Effective Schools Program used in Calgary schools, the "outreach" aspect of the Religion program, and Community Leagues.

Alternatives to Community School Funding Arrangements

Responses to recommendations for different funding arrangements from those currently in place are summarized in Table 37. The school board representatives that recommended increasing funds to include more or all schools indicated that the current limited access to funds was unfair. In the case of making funds available to the total system, one school board representative made the case because the jurisdiction was small, the other made no case in terms of size. Two school board representatives made positive comments about the Flexibility grant.

One Friend offered a comment related to current funding practice: more stringent measures than are currently in place were recommended "to be sure the money is not being ripped off by the central offices and school boards." The same respondent also observed that funding likely has more impact in small schools than in large ones.

Table 37
Alternatives to Current Funding Arrangements

Funding Arrangements	School Board Rep's	Principals
no change	3	9
expand to more or all schools	4	---
increased funds including annual adjustment	3	3
make funds available to total system	2	---
consider capital depreciation	1	---
provision for supplies in flexibility grant	---	1

Adequacy of Grant for Secretarial Support, Community Use, and Flexibility

School staff and Community School Friends were asked to judge the adequacy of funding for secretarial support, community use and flexibility. Teachers and coordinators often did not believe they were in a position to answer; their comments are noted.

The secretarial support grant provides up to $16,750 for a

secretary and basic supplies. Assessments of its adequacy are presented in Table 38.

Table 38
Adequacy of Secretarial Support Grant

Assessment	Principals	Friends
adequate as is	7	1
add inflation factor	1	---
increase the grant	3	2
increase grant for supplies	2	---
no response	---	1

The community use of schools grant provides $12.00 per hour of community use up to 1,540 hours ($18,480.) The grant covers janitor and facility supervision costs, utilities, depreciation and other direct costs. Any user charge is to be reduced by the $12/hour support allowance. In smaller communities, non-profit groups pay no fee to use the school as a result of this grant. In large city schools, the union rates for building maintenance are up to $42.50 per hour for weekend use and the $12/hour support still results in formidable user fees to groups such as ethno-cultural groups in Calgary (according to an Alberta Culture representative). One principal commented that language culture classes have access to funding. The assessment of the community use grant is presented in Table 39.

The flexibility grant is designed to provide the school with some funds to be used at the discretion of the principal, with advice from

the advisory committee. The funds are to be disbursed in support of the Community School's objectives to a maximum of $5,000.

Table 39
Adequacy of Community Use Grant

Assessment	Principals	Friends
adequate as is	7	1
add inflation factor	1	---
increase the grant	2	2
no response	3	1

There has been some controversy about this part of the total grant. It can be a source of envy for other schools in the same school system who receive no Community School Grant but see tangible benefits accruing from the flexibility grant to the community school in their district.

The flexibility grant is appreciated by community schools and no end of praise was offered in its support by school staff. Assessments of the adequacy of the grant are presented in Table 40.

Not all principals seek advice from a parent advisory group on the use of the funds, or they may seek advice on part of the funds only. One principal suggested that if the fund is at the principals' discretion, then advisory committee advice should not be necessary.

Table 40
Adequacy of the Flexibility Grant

Assessment	Principals	Friends
adequate as is	6	---
add inflation factor	1	1
increase the grant	2	2
no comment regarding adequacy	4	1

Teachers at one school noted that they needed more money for field trip transportation. At their school the funds were spent mainly on professional development.

Problems concerning funds were only referred to in one school. In that school there was a question about the balance of the community use grant that was not paid out in direct costs. It was not apparent what the balance was used for. The Executive Director recommended that in future, the community use grant be limited to direct expenses only.

Commitment and Understanding of the Ten Dimensions of the Community School Concept

Questions were addressed to School Board Representatives, principals, Friends, coordinators and teachers. Staff and community people in non-community schools were asked questions as well.

Responses are summarized in Table 41. "Other" school board representative comments included:

- a serious philosophic commitment is needed
- additional personnel provide the commitment
- commitment has to be absolute at the principal level
- a school can function as a community school without <u>total</u> commitment to all dimensions (n=2)

Table 41
Commitment Needed to Become a Community School

Extent of Commitment	School Bd. Rep's	Principals	Friends
very strong or complete need high majority of committed staff	3 1	4 3	1 ---
a lot	2	1	1
other comments	5	4	2
no response	1	---	---

Three principals concurred on the last point above; two mentioned facility adaptation as an exception. One principal recalled "three years of apprehension" before they started their charter. Questions concerned whether the program would be more work, use of classrooms, and parents telling teachers what to teach in classrooms.

One Friend noted that administrators and leadership personnel are almost always very highly committed but that commitment developed over time as a result of professional activities. Another Friend noted that at least a minimum level of activity must be demonstrated in each of the 10 dimensions.

Teachers did not give a response to the question aside from noting at one school that a lot of effort was required to develop the charter.

In terms of understanding needed to become a community school, responses are indicated in Table 42. "Other" responses of school board representatives included noting that understanding was provided by additional personnel, and that some schools not formally designated have accomplished the same thing although funding has since allowed them to do more. One Friend noted that as well as understanding, educators need skills and techniques, and hence more professional development time.

The "Other" responses of principals included the following (each comment was made only once unless otherwise indicated; one person made two unrelated comments which are numbered separately):

1) the highest understanding was required for the dimensions of involvement of parents and community members, collegial atmosphere, and opening school facilities for community use; the lowest level was required for facility adaptation; and the other dimensions ranged in between
2) understanding is a growth process (n=3)
3) understanding is a precursor to commitment
4) continuous inservice is needed
5) teachers need to be trained to use aides
6) community related curriculum at the senior high level is the biggest difficulty

Response from non-community schools indicated that principals see the need for money (n=2) and advisory input (n=1) for them to become a Community School. Teachers at two out of four non-community schools felt their school operated similarly to the way a Community School operates. Three non-community school principals felt their school operated similarly to the way a Community School operates in many ways.

Asked whether or not it would be in the best interest of their school to become a Community School

17 out of 21 parents

6 out of 10 community members

3 out of 4 principals

3 out of 4 interview groups of teachers

gave a positive response.

Table 42

Understanding Needed to Become a Community School

Extent of Understanding	School Bd. Rep's	Principals	Friends
good understanding of 10 dimensions	6	3	3
leadership needs clear understanding	1	---	---
other comments	2	7	1
no response	2	2	---

Future Implications for the Community School Program of the Management Finance Plan

The Management Finance Plan or Block Funding provides lump sum funding to school boards rather than providing various ear-marked sums for specific purposes.

The majority of Assistant Deputy Ministers believed targetted funding was necessary to continue support of Community School

programming. It was believed the Program would disappear with block funding.

Questions were raised about the merits of continuing the practice of awarding the same size grants to the same schools over an extended time period. Suggestions were to spread the money around to more schools by providing start-up funds that are phased down to zero or a maintenance level with local people picking up the cost as demanded; this strategy could be combined with rotation of schools on grant support so that "as many schools as possible would be touched with the philosophy over a period of time."

Future Implications of the Secondary School Program Review

The Secondary Education Program Review Policy Statement (June, 1985) has eight guiding principles. Principle #5 reads as follows:

> Opportunities must be provided to involve the community in secondary education programs and to recognize and support learning experiences which take place outside of schools.
>
> p.8

The concept of Community Partnership supports Principle #5 and includes

- use of educational services outside the school
- use of community resource people including school-community exchange
- expanded practical experience programs
- direct linkages with community agencies serving youth
- a partnership among students, parents, the school and the community (p.16)

Both school board representatives and principals were asked if

they thought the Secondary School Program Revision would effect community school activities. Responses are summarized in Table 43.

Three school board representatives indicated it was too soon to give a response on the recent revision. "Other" responses of this group reflected concern that the secondary school focus was changing away from the community school concept. The "other" principal response indicated the belief that the revision detracts from the community school philosopy in that schools will not be allowed to be unique under the revised program.

Table 43
Perceived Effect of the Secondary School Program Revision on Community School Activities

Effect	School Bd. Rep's	Principals
none	4	4
offers support	2	3
other comments	2	1
no response	3	5

The Revision of the School Act

The School Act is under revision and the new act will be made public later this year. The involvement of the community in the community school program was examined during the revision process as was the involvement of the community in the early childhood program. Program components from both programs were considered in developing the

Revision to the School Act. It is impossible at this time to comment on future implications of the new School Act since it has yet to be released.

Future Implications of Societal Trends

An aging population and an increasing percentage of working women are two trends of significance to the Community School Program. An aging population means a lower percentage of families with school-age children and a higher percentage of tax support from people without school-age children. As one IDCSC member noted, increased use of and involvement in schools by people without school-aged children would broaden the portion of the community receiving direct benefits from their tax dollars.

The increase in working women reduces the pool of female volunteers. (One Community School reported decreased use of volunteers since it had acquired funding to hire the same people.) It also reduces available free time for adult education pursuits and school-related activities. The Community School Concept depends on community people having time to be involved in the school. This community involvement may have to come increasingly from the workplace and from community agencies and less from free-time involvement of parents.

Summary

The Interdepartmental School Committee has generally low visibility. Its most important function has been the approval of schools for community school grant funding. The Committee carries out its work through the highly visible Executive Director.

The four member departments each make substantial contributions

to the program through either direct or indirect funding and staff assistance; however, the chairman of the committee and the executive director are both responsible to Alberta Education; direct community school funding to the schools comes from Alberta Education; and Alberta Education is seen to be the department with the leadership role.

The Committee has worked out a less than complete harmony of roles in terms of services provided to the schools; it has less than complete authority over budget decisions connected with the community school program; and it has less than complete authority over activities or evaluation of the Executive Director position.

The Committee has not found as active a role for itself in supporting the program once the schools have been approved as it had during the charter approval process, aside from a monitoring role which is essentially hired out.

Some suggestions were made for improving the guidelines and procedures for approving community schools. The concept of preparing a charter was considered a valid way for the school to organize its resources and to establish communications necessary to the operation of a community school. There was support for simplification and streamlining of procedures.

There were mixed views of the impact of the Alberta Community School Program Position on the people involved at the school and community level. The additional community school positions were seen to take up much of the added workload. The community school concept was seen to have no effect on the completion of diploma requirements by most school board representatives and principals.

Of the three community school leadership positions, each half time or less, the position of community school coordinator was judged to have least overlap with services offered by or accessible from

others either within the school or from the local Recreation Board, Further Education Council or Further Education department in large urban school systems. There was some question raised about whether the community school principal should hold any of the community school positions. There was mixed support for the program from those teachers who were interviewed.

School board representatives suggested many alternatives to the community school definition; principals prefer to keep the current definition. Many other programs offered by schools not receiving community school grants and by other agencies were seen to have aspects in common with community schools.

About half the community school principals thought the current grants for secretarial support, community use, and the flexibility grant were adequate; the remainder requested more funds including a built-in inflation factor, or gave no comment. More stringent measures to see that grant monies are spent in the school as proposed was recommended by one community school friend and the same issue was brought up in one community school.

A significant level of commitment and understanding was seen as necessary for a non-community school to become a community school. The majority of people interviewed in the non-community schools thought it would be in their school's best interest to become a community school.

There was support from most assistant deputy ministers and from some school board representatives for extending community school funding to more schools; suggestions were made to provide start-up funds that would be phased down over time , and to rotate schools on grant support. One of the eight Secondary School Program Review guiding principles supports many aspects of the current community school program. Societal trends were seen to have potential impact on the program in future.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Nine conclusions were drawn from this evaluation of community schools. One or more recommendations were made for all conclusions but one.

1982-86 Comparison

Conclusion:

The only change consistently reported from 1982 to 1986 in the community school program was an increase in the study of the local community.

1986 Replication Results

Conclusion:

The community school program with the accompanying grant has a significant effect on community orientation of participating schools. More frequent occurrence of activities relating to eight of the ten community school dimensions was reported in community schools than in non-community schools.

Recommendation:

1. The community school program should be continued with modifications outlined in the following recommendations.

2. The current dimensions should be reviewed with consideration given to limiting the list to those dimensions that were found to occur

significantly more frequently in community schools than in non-community schools.

Modifications to the IDCSC

Conclusion:

The IDCSC fulfills an important role in bringing together the four departments that put resources into the community school program. The Committee was most active during the years when the program was starting up and there were many school charters to approve. It has not found as active a role to take in maintaining and directing the program from year to year. The Committee does not have authority to approve all major budget and staff decisions.

Recommendations:

1. Add some (e.g. four) representatives from community schools to the Committee for one or two year terms on a rotating basis.

2. Committee meetings should be held on a frequent and regular basis (e.g. every three months) including an annual meeting where major issues are discussed.

3. Chairmanship and recording secretary functions should be rotated among department representatives every two years.

4. All major budget decisions related to the program including school grants and expenses associated with the Executive Director's office (Friends, workshop, meetings, etc.) should be approved by the Committee.

5. Major responsibilities of the Executive Director in terms of time allocated to the position should be approved annually coincident with the annual evaluation of the Executive Director by the Committee. The

recommendation regarding the annual evaluation should be formally submitted by the Committee to the Director, Support Programs, Alberta Education.

6. An index to Document #35R2 should be developed so that contents can be quickly accessed by new committee members and others. Developing a list of motions that have been passed by the Committee would also assist new members to understand the history of the Committee.

Evaluation of Community Schools

Conclusion:

The number of evaluations community schools are subjected to are too onerous. On top of their own self-conducted annual evaluation, community schools are subject to a five-year mini-evaluation, regional office evaluations and local school board evaluations. One community school reported being evaluated 15 times since it became a community school.

Recommendations:

1. The Committee should request that Planning Services Branch propose a strategy for community school evaluation that ensures evaluations are coordinated, kept to the minimum required for making sound judgements, and conducted by individuals with no vested interest in the program as much as possible. The strategy should be reviewed every two years by both Planning Services Branch and the IDCSC Committee.

2. Alberta Education could develop a simple computer program to keep track of all outside evaluations in each school for each school year. This information could be used by all levels of administration for both monitoring and research purposes to prevent the number of evaluations in some schools from interfering with school programs.

Selection Criteria for Community Schools

Conclusion:

Applications for funding are judged on the basis of the charter presented. This practice may discriminate against parent groups who do not have high writing standards and it may discriminate in favour of groups who have extensive experience in preparing proposals.

Recommendation:

Schools should be selected on a basis of need and merit. Need could be measured in terms of a. financial need of the school community and b. lack of existing provisions for community involvement in and use of the school. Merit could be measured in terms of a. soundness of proposals in the charter and b. verification of plans and communication channels referred to in the charter through discussions at the school and in the community with key groups who will carry out the charter.

Charter Development

Conclusion:

The committee approach to charter development is sound but some aspects of charter development could be simplified at no cost to the underlying objective (to develop detailed plans and establish the necessary communication channels for operating as a community school).

Recommendations:

1. A handbook should be made available to schools preparing a charter comparable to that made available to Friends.

2. Approval of municipal council should be optional.

3. Response to local needs should take priority over strict adherence to the list of community school dimensions.

4. Charters should be kept short to concentrate thinking and reduce paper work. A short charter would also be easier to refer to as a working document than the current charters which have a good deal of background information included.

Community School Leadership Positions

Conclusion:

Community school leadership positions need to be reviewed for overlap both among the positions and with other school and community agency position reponsibilities.

Recommendations:

1. Overlapping interest in adult education is an area that committee members should work out among the departments represented. A long-term community school leadership position is not needed to provide a service that could be made available by local agencies.

2. A relationship between the curriculum coordinator function and the responsibilities of department heads in junior and senior high schools and vice-principals or principals in elementary schools needs to be worked out and the overlap removed.

3. The remaining community school leadership responsibilities could be combined into one position or left as more than one position that would report to the school principal. The position(s) should not be filled by the school principal.

4. Funding guidelines for the community school leadership position(s) should be rewritten to reflect the above recommendations.

Community Use Grant

Conclusion:

The community school use grant is subject to local interpretations by school boards that may lead to questions about its destination. As well there is a problem with the cost of weekend janitorial rates in large cities.

Recommendation:

A committee of community school people having problems related to the community use grant should be struck to find solutions to the problems.

Funding for Community Schools

Conclusion:

Considering that out of 1533 schools in the province, only 67 receive community school funding and many others are doing what they can to relate to their community with no additional funds, the current funding system is inequitable. Given the current economic situation in Alberta, there is no basis for expecting the total grant to the Community School Program to increase other than to reflect inflation.

Recommendation:

Make funding available to all schools that satisfy the selection criteria by a. phasing down funding to a maintenance level after a period of implementation

b. encouraging schools to pursue additional funding at the local level

and c. if a. and b. combined do not make available sufficient funds for all qualifying schools that request funding, then a time limit for provincial funding support to community schools should be set so that over a period of years, all schools that qualify for community school funding support would have their turn to receive it.

APPENDIX

Definitions

Community School Coordinator - A person assigned part- or full-time responsibilities for coordinating community-related activities in the community school.

Curriculum Coordinator - A person assigned part-time responsibilities for helping teachers to build community-related topics and activities into their teaching as well as other duties.

Further Education Councils - Councils organized at the local level to administer further education courses for adults in the community. They are supported by Alberta Advanced Education.

Further Education Coordinator - A person hired by the Further Education Council to carry out the work of the Council.

Community School Friend - There are currently 43 Community School Friends, about half of whom are community school principals, 7 hold community school positions and the others are associated with school boards, colleges, government departments or are private citizens. Friends work under contract to help new schools develop charters and conduct evaluation activities for the IDCSC.

IDCSC - The Interdepartmental Community School Committee has members from the four departments participating in the Community School Program: Education, Advanced Education, Culture and Recreation and Parks. The Committee approves schools for funding, oversees the program and hires an Executive Director to carry out its work.

Survey Questions Assigned to Each Respondent Group
for Each Replication Study Question

Study Question	Respondent Group			
	Principal Community School Coordinator Teacher Community Member Parent	Grade 6	Grade 9-12	I-A Rep
1	1,2,3,4	1,2,3,4,5,12	1,2,3,4,14	
2	5,6,7,8	6,10	5,6,12	
3	9,10	7	8	
4	13	8,15	9,17	
5	11,12	13,14	15,16	
6	14,17	9	10	1,2,3,4,6, 7,8,9,10
7	Facility Adaptation Questionnaire (principals)			
8	18	11	13	5
9	15			
10	16,19,20	11	11	12

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL ITEMS

1. School _____

2. How long have you been principal in your present school:
(Count the present year as a complete year.) _____ Year(s)

3. In what year did this school become a community school (if applicable)? _____

The statements below describe the responsibilities and activities that a school might undertake as part of its educational role. RELATE THESE STATEMENTS TO YOUR SCHOOL IN ANSWERING EACH OF THE QUESTIONS.

Step 1: Circle the appropriate number(s) according to the scale provided below to indicate the number of times your school carries on each of the specified activities in a typical school year.

1 means Never
2 means Seldom (1-2 times per year)
3 means Occasionally (3-4 times per year)
4 means Often (5-8 times per year)
5 means Very Often (9 or more times per year)

Step 2: Rate the importance of each activity by circling the appropriate number.

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	1. The school uses human community resources to enhance the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. Students go into the community to use available facilities and resources.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. Students go into the community to provide community service while they learn.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. The school emphasizes the study of the local community.	1	2	3	4	5

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	5. The school involves parents in providing advice on the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6. The school involves parents in helping teachers through voluntary service.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7. The school involves community members other than parents in providing advice on the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8. The school involves community members other than parents in helping teachers through voluntary service.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9. The School Board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10. The administration of this school encourages teacher participation in school decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	11. The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12. The school staff includes students as resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	13. The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	14. The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	15. The school encourages a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	16. The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	17. The school participates in community improvement projects.	1	2	3	4	5

Please check ✓

Yes ___ No ___	18. The school facility is available for community use on an extended time basis daily and yearly.	1 2 3 4 5
Yes ___ No ___	19. The school makes community members feel welcome at the school.	1 2 3 4 5
Yes ___ No ___	20. The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school.	1 2 3 4 5

COMMUNITY SCHOOL COORDINATOR(S) QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL ITEMS:

1. Name of School _____

2. Check ✓ one in A and one in B as they relate to your assignment.

(A) Assignment

(a) Community School Coordinator ☐
(b) Principal ☐
(c) Vice Principal ☐
(d) Teacher ☐
(e) Paraprofessional ☐
(f) Other (specify) ☐
_____

(B) Percentage of time devoted to community school coordination

(i) less than 25% ☐
(ii) 25 - 50% ☐
(iii) 51 - 75% ☐
(iv) more than 75% ☐

3. The statements below describe the responsibilities and activities that a school might undertake as part of its educational role. RELATE THESE STATEMENTS TO YOUR SCHOOL IN ANSWERING EACH OF THE QUESTIONS.

Step 1: Circle the appropriate number(s) according to the scale provided below to indicate the number of times your school carries on each of the specified activities in a normal school year.

1 means Never
2 means Seldom (1-2 times per year)
3 means Occasionally (3-4 times per year)
4 means Often (5-8 times per year)
5 means Very Often (9 or more times per year)

Step 2: Rate the importance of each activity by circling the appropriate number.

	Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)
	1	2	3	4	5

	Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
	1	2	3	4	5

1. The school uses human community resources to enhance the school curriculum.

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	2. Students go into the community to use available facilities and resources.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. Students go into the community to provide community services while they learn.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. The school emphasizes the study of the local community.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5. The school involves parents in providing advice on the school cirriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6. The school involves parents in helping teachers through voluntary service.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7. The school involves community members other than parents in providing advice on the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8. The school involves community members other than parents in helping teachers through voluntary service	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9. The School Board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10. The principal of the school encourages teacher participation in school decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	11. The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12. The school staff includes students as resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	13. The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	14. The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area.	1	2	3	4	5

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	15. The school encourages a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	16. The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	17. The school participates in community improvement projects.	1	2	3	4	5

Please check ✓

Yes ___ No ___	18. The school facility is available for community use on an extended time basis daily and yearly.	1	2	3	4	5
Yes ___ No ___	19. The school makes community members feel welcome at the school.	1	2	3	4	5
Yes ___ No ___	20. The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school.	1	2	3	4	5

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL ITEMS:

1. School _____ Grade _____

2. How long have you taught in your present school?
(Count the present year as a complete year.) _____ Year(s)

The statements below describe the responsibilities and activities that a school might undertake as part of its educational role. RELATE THESE STATEMENTS TO YOUR SCHOOL IN ANSWERING EACH OF THE QUESTIONS.

Step 1: Circle the appropriate number(s) according to the scale provided below to indicate the number of times you carry on each of the specified activities in a typical school year.

1 means Never
2 means Seldom (1-2 times per year)
3 means Occasionally (3-4 times per year)
4 means Often (5-8 times per year)
5 means Very Often (9 or more times per year)

Step 2: Rate the importance of each activity by circling the appropriate number.

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	1. I make use of human community resources to enhance the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. My students go into the community to use available facilities and resources.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. My students go into the community to provide community service while they learn.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. I emphasize the study of the local community.	1	2	3	4	5

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	5. I involve parents in providing advice on the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6. I involve parents in helping through voluntary service.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7. I involve community members other than parents in providing advice on the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8. I involve community members other than parents in helping through voluntary service.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9. The School Board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10. The principal of the school encourages teacher participation in school decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	11. The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12. The school staff includes students as resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	13. The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	14. The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	15. I conduct the study of problems and issues of importance to the community with my students.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	16. The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	17. The school participates in community improvement projects.	1	2	3	4	5

						Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
Please check ✔										
Yes ___	No ___	18.	The school facility is available for community use on an extended time basis daily and yearly.			1	2	3	4	5
Yes ___	No ___	19.	The school makes community members feel welcome at the school.			1	2	3	4	5
Yes ___	No ____	20.	The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school.			1	2	3	4	5

COMMUNITY MEMBERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL ITEMS:

Is any member of your immediate family attending the school from which you have received this questionnaire?
Check ✔ one . . . . . yes ____
no ____

The statements below describe the responsibilities and activities that a school might undertake as part of its educational role. RELATE THESE STATEMENTS TO THE SCHOOL FROM WHICH YOU RECEIVED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN ANSWERING EACH OF THE QUESTIONS.

Step 1: Circle the appropriate number(s) according to the scale provided below to indicate the number of times you think your school carries on each of the specified activities in a typical school year.

1 means Never
2 means Seldom (1-2 times per year)
3 means Occasionally (3-4 times per year)
4 means Often (5-8 times per year)
5 means Very Often (9 or more times per year)

Step 2: Rate the importance of each activity by circling the appropriate number.

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	1. The school uses human community resources to enhance the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. Students go into the community to use available facilities and resources.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. Students go into the community to provide community service while they learn.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. The school emphasizes the study of the local community.	1	2	3	4	5

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	5. The school involves parents in providing advice on the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6. The school involves parents in helping teachers through voluntary service.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7. The school involves community members other than parents in providing advice on the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8. The school involves community members other than parents in helping teachers through voluntary service.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9. The School Board encourages teacher participation in school district decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10. The principal of the school encourages teacher participation in school decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	11. The school staff includes community adults as resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12. The school staff includes students as resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	13. The school provides educational activities involving people of all ages.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	14. The school cooperates with other community organizations and agencies to provide comprehensive educational, recreational, cultural and social services in the school attendance area.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	15. The school encourages a study of problems and issues of importance to the community in the school curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	16. The school organizes activities to foster cooperative relations with the community.	1	2	3	4	5

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)

						1	2	3	4	5
						Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
					17. The school participates in community improvement projects.	1	2	3	4	5
Please check ✔										
Yes ___	No ___				18. The school facility is available for community use on an extended time basis daily and yearly.	1	2	3	4	5
Yes ___	No ___				19. The school makes community members feel welcome at the school.	1	2	3	4	5
Yes ___	No ___				20. The present school program has resulted in effective communication between the community and the school.	1	2	3	4	5

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE -- Grade 9 or 12

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL ITEMS:

1. School _____ Grade _____

2. How long have you attended this school?
(Count the present year as a complete year.) _____ Year(s)

The statements below describe the responsibilities and activities that a school might undertake as part of its educational role. RELATE THESE STATEMENTS TO YOUR SCHOOL IN ANSWERING EACH OF THE QUESTIONS.

Step 1: Circle the appropriate number(s) according to the scale provided below to indicate the number of times each of the specified activities takes place in a typical school year.

1 means Never
2 means Seldom (1-2 times per year)
3 means Occasionally (3-4 times per year)
4 means Often (5-8 times per year)
5 means Very Often (9 or more times per year)

Step 2: Rate the importance of each activity by circling the appropriate number.

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	1. Guests come to my class to talk abour topics in my school subject.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. I go on field trips with my class.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. I help people in the community with my class.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. My class studies the local community.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5. Parents help my teacher(s) as volunteers.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6. Community members other than parents help my teacher(s) as volunteers.	1	2	3	4	5

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	7. My class studies problems and issues which are important to our community.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8. The teacher(s) ask(s) us for ideas on how the school could be better.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9. The school has organized activities for people of all ages.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10. The school cooperates with community organizations and agencies.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	11. The school organizes activities to improve relations with the community.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12. My parents come to visit my school.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	13. Other people, besides teachers and students, use my school.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	14. I prepare community related projects with my class.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	15. I help students in my class with their learning.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	16. I help students in other classes with their learning.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	17. I participate in educational activities in my school with people of all ages.	1	2	3	4	5

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE -- Grade 6

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL ITEMS:

1. School _____

2. How long have you attended this school?
(Count the present year as a complete year.) _____ Year(s)

Each of the following statements describes activities that a school may undertake. Consider each activity as it has applied in the 1985/86 school year.
FOR EACH STATEMENT, PLEASE CHECK ✓ IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACE:

Example: I studied the history of my community. Yes ✓ No ___

---

1. Guests came to may class to talk about topics of interest. Yes ___ No ___
2. I went on field trips with my class. Yes ___ No ___
3. I helped people in the community with my class. Yes ___ No ___
4. My class studied the local community. Yes ___ No ___
5. My class studied communities in the world. Yes ___ No ___
6. Parents helped my teacher(s) as volunteers. Yes ___ No ___
7. The teacher(s) asked us for ideas on how the school could be better. Yes ___ No ___
8. The school has organized activities for people of all ages. Yes ___ No ___
9. The school cooperated with community organizations and agencies. Yes ___ No ___
10. My parents came to visit the school. Yes ___ No ___
11. Other people, besides teachers and students, used my school. Yes ___ No ___
12. I prepared community related projects with my class. Yes ___ No ___
13. I helped students in my class with their learning. Yes ___ No ___
14. I helped students in other classes with their learning. Yes ___ No ___
15. I participated in school activities with people of all ages. Yes ___ No ___

Thank you!

INTERAGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL ITEMS:

Please specify the name of your agency/organization: _____

PART I

The statements below describe the responsibilities and activities that a school might undertake as part of its educational role. IN ANSWERING EACH OF THE QUESTIONS, PLEASE RELATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS TO THE SCHOOL FROM WHICH YOU RECEIVED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

Step 1: Circle the appropriate number(s) according to the scale provided below to indicate the number of times each of the specified activities takes place in a typical school year.

1 means Never
2 means Seldom (1-2 times per year)
3 means Occasionally (3-4 times per year)
4 means Often (5-8 times per year)
5 means Very Often (9 or more times per year)

Step 2: Rate the importance of each activity by circling the appropriate number.

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
1	2	3	4	5	1. The school administration meets periodically with my agency/organization to discuss new developments in the community.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. My agency/organization has sponsored an activity in the school program.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. School personnel let my agency/organization know about new developments in the school.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4. My agency/organization has asked the school for help with services we provide.	1	2	3	4	5

Never	Seldom (1-2 per year)	Occasionally (3-4 per year)	Often (5-8 per year)	Very Often (9 or more per year)
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5

Please check ✓

Yes ___ No ___

Yes ___ No ___

		Of No Importance	Of Limited Importance	Of Average Importance	Of Considerable Importance	Of Critical Importance
5.	My agency/organization utilizes school facilities whenever needed.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Community residents have been referred to my agency/organization by the school.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	This school offers activities which involve people of all ages.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	This school and my agency/organization have jointly pursued a project.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	My agency/organization has referred residents to an activity offered by the school.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	The school has assisted my agency/organization when we have asked for help.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	The services of my agency/organization are duplicated by the school program.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	There is effective communication between the school and my agency/organization.	1	2	3	4	5

PART II

How effective has the school been in working with your agency/ organization? Circle the most appropriate number.

		Not At All Effective				Highly Effective
13.	Providing needs assessment data to your agency/ organization.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Distributing program information for your agency/organization.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Helping to avoid duplication of services.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Helping to solve mutual problems (i.e., facility use, purchasing, funding, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Helping to explore new areas of cooperative involvement.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Accomplishing agreed upon tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Responding to community needs.	1	2	3	4	5

20. Are there other areas in which your agency would like to cooperate with the school?

Yes ___ No ___

21. If yes, please specify: _____

_____

_____

_____

FACILITY ADAPTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete the following items.

Name of School _____

1. Has your school facility been designed to facilitate community use? Please check (✓) one.

No ☐ Yes ☐

2. Check the design features for community use that apply to your school.

a. Multi-use area . . . . . ☐

b. Kitchen . . . . . ☐

c. Offices for community services . . . . . ☐

d. Senior citizens' centre . . . . . ☐

e. Community room . . . . . ☐

f. Swimming pool . . . . . ☐

g. Library . . . . . ☐

3. If other design features for your school apply, please describe briefly:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Has your school facility been modified or adapted to facilitate community use? Please check (✔) one.

No ☐ Yes ☐

5. Check the modifications or adaptations for community use that have been made in your school. Please check (✔) all items that apply.

a. Multi-use area . . . . . ☐

b. Kitchen . . . . . ☐

c. Offices for community services . . . . . ☐

d. Senior citizens' centre . . . . . ☐

e. Community room . . . . . ☐

f. Swimming pool . . . . . ☐

g. Library . . . . . ☐

6. If other modifications to enhance community uses apply to your school, please describe briefly:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Were the teachers involved in any facility modifications for community use? Please check (✔) one.

No ☐ Yes ☐

8. Were community members involved in any facility modifications for community use? Please check (✔) one.

No ☐ Yes ☐

Thank you for your assistance.

Interview Items Assigned to Each Respondent Group
for each Replication Study Question

Study Question	Respondent Group					
	Principals	Community Sch. Coor.	Teachers	Students	Parents Comm.	I-A Rep
1	3,4	3,4	1,2	1		
2	5-8	5-8	3-6	2,3	1,2	
3	9,10	9,10	7,8	4,5	3	
4	13-18	13-18	11,12	7	5,6	
5	11-12	11-12	9,10	2,3,6		
6	19,20	19,20	13,14	8		2-8
7	21-24					
8	25-26	21,22	15			
9	27-28	23,24	16,17	9,10		
10	29-30	25,26	18,19	11,12		

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

During this interview, I will ask you questions about your school and how it involves itself with the community. I will be conducting this interview in four Designated Community Schools and four non-Designated Schools in Alberta. These interviews will be used to verify and clarify, and elaborate on information obtained through the questionnaires of a comparative study of Designated Community Schools and non-Designated Schools in Alberta.

Your answers will be treated anonymously: only a summary of the comments will be reported.

1. Before I ask specific questions, I would appreciate it if you would describe briefly the philosophy of this school.

2. Could you also describe this community.

3. Does your school implement curriculum that is related to real life situations in the community?

   Yes

   No

4. How does your school implement curriculum that is related to real life situations in the community.

   a. field trips.....

   b. guest speakers.....

   c. study of the local community.....

   d. study of community services.....

      please specify.....

   e. use of community materials in the classroom.....

   f. work experience (internship).....

   g. classes in the community taught by community resource people.....

   h. special projects in the community.....

   i. exchanges.....

   j. other, please specify

5. Does your school involve parents in the school?

   Yes

   No

6. How does your school involve parents in the school?

   a. parental curricular advice.....

   b. classroom volunteer.....

   c. member of task force.....

   d. resource person in classes.....

   e. parent advisory committee.....

f. committees, please specify.....

g. if other, please specify

7. Does your school involve community members other than parents in your school?

Yes

No

8. How does your school involve other community members in the school?

a. classroom volunteer.....

b. member of task force.....

c. resource person in classes.....

d. advisory committee.....

e. committees, please specify.....

f. if other, please specify

9. When decisions are made in your school, is the advice and opinions of the groups most affected by the decision sought?

   Yes

   No

10. How does your school foster broad-based participation in decision-making in the school?

    a. staff meetings.....

    b. parental advisory group.....

    c. student advisory group.....

    d. formal communications program (goal setting, dealing with conflict, problem solving, effective meetings, planning, and decision making.).....

    e. special meetings, please specify

       grade or subject area meetings.....

    f. if other, please specify

11. Are students used as resource personnel in your school?

    Yes

    No

12. How are students used as resource personnel in your school?

    a. across age tutoring.....

    b. coaching.....

    c. community service projects.....

    d. if other, please specify

d. if other, please specify

13. Does your school offer programs for adults?

Yes

No

14. What kinds of programs does your school offer for adults?

a. educational.....

b recreational.....

c. cultural.....

d. social.....

e. if other, please specify

15. Does your school offer programs for pre-schoolers?

Yes

No

16. What kinds of programs does your school offer pre-schoolers?

a. day care.....

b. nursery.....

c. recreational.....

d. cultural.....

e. social.....

f. if other, please specify

17. Does your school encourage activities involving people of all ages?

Yes

No

18. How does your school encourage activities involving people of all ages?

a. recreational programs.....

b. cultural programs.....

c. basic literacy programs.....

d. special classes.....

e. if other, please specify

19. Does your school cooperate with other community organizations and agencies?

Yes

No

20. How does your school cooperate with other community organizations and agencies?

a. advisory councils.....

b. joint planning.....

c. interagency communications.....

d. sharing of personnel.....

e. sharing of financial resources.....

f. sharing of physical resources.....

21. Were design features incorporated into your school to facilitate community use?

Yes

No

22. What kinds of design features have been incorporated in your school to facilitate community use?

a. multi-use area.....

b. kitchen.....

c. community organization offices.....

d. senior citizens center.....

e. library.....

f. swimming pool.....

g. community room.....

h. if other, please specify.....

23. Have modifications been made in the school to facilitate community use?

Yes

No

24. What kinds of modification have been made in the school facility to facilitate community use?

a. multi-use area.....

b. kitchen.....

c. community offices.....

d. senior citizens center.....

e. library.....

f. swimming pool.....

g. community room.....

h. if other, please specify

25. Is your school available for community use?

Yes

No

26. When is your school available for community use?

a. every evening.....

b. on weekends.....

c. during holidays.....

d. during the summer.....

e. all year round.....

27. Does your school encourage a study by students of problems and issues of significance to the community?

Yes

No

28. How does your school encourage a study by students of problems and issues of significance to the community?

    a. special task forces.....

    b. public forums/meetings/seminars.....

    c. interagency cooperation.....

    d. written policy.....

    e. if other, please specify

29. Does your school foster a sense of community?

    Yes

    No

30. How does your school foster a sense of community?

    a. organization of "get-togethers" at the school.....

    b. participation in community activities/projects.....

    c. services for community members.....

    d. program for community betterment.....

    e. if other, please specify

31. Overall, what is the most important way in which your school becomes involved with your community? Why?

32. Are there other comments that you would like to make?

COMMUNITY SCHOOL COORDINATOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

During this interview, I will ask you questions about your school and how it involves itself with the community. I will be conducting this interview in four Designated Community Schools and four non-Designated Schools in Alberta. These interviews will be used to verify and clarify, and elaborate on information obtained through the questionnaires of a comperative study of Designated Community Schools and non-Designated Schools in Alberta.

Your answers will be treated anonymously: only a summary of the comments will be reported.

1. Before I ask specific questions, I would appreciate it if you would describe briefly the philosophy of this school.

2. Could you also describe this community.

3. Does your school implement curriculum that is related to real life situations in the community?

   Yes

   No

4. How does your school implement curriculum that is related to real life situations in the community.

   a. field trips.....

   b. guest speakers.....

   c. study of the local community.....

   d. study of community services.....

      please specify.....

   e. use of community materials in the classroom.....

   f. work experience (internship).....

g. classes in the community taught by community resource people.....

h. special projects in the community.....

i. exchanges.....

j. other, please specify

5. Does your school involve parents in the school?

Yes

No

6. How does your school involve parents in the school?

a. classroom volunteer.....

b. member of task force.....

c. resource person in classes.....

d. advisory committee.....

e. if other, please specify

7. Does your school involve community members other than parents in your school?

Yes

No

8. How does your school involve other community members in the school?

   a. classroom volunteer.....

   b. member of task force.....

   c. resource person in classes.....

   d. advisory committee.....

   e. if other, please specify.....

9. When decisions are made in your school, is the advice and opinions of the groups most affected by the decision sought?

   Yes

   No

10. How does your school foster broad-based participation in decision-making in the school?

   a. teacher advisory group.....

   b. parental advisory group.....

   c. student advisory group.....

   d. formal communications program (goal setting, dealing with conflict, problem solving, effective meetings, planning, and decision making.).....

   e. special meetings, please specify.....

   f. if other, please specify

11. Are students used as resource personnel in your school?

   Yes

   No

12. How are students used as resource personnel in your school?

    a. across age tutoring.....

    b. coaching.....

    c. community service projects.....

    d. if other, please specify

13. Does your school offer programs for adults?

    Yes

    No

14. What kinds of programs does your school offer for adults?

    a. educational.....

    b recreational.....

    c. cultural.....

    d. social.....

    e. if other, please specify

15. Does your school offer programs for pre-schoolers?

    Yes

    No

16. What kinds of programs does your school offer pre-schoolers?

    a. day care.....

    b. nursery.....

    c. recreational.....

    d. cultural.....

e. social.....

f. if other, please specify

17. Does your school encourage activities involving people of all ages?

Yes

No

18. How does your school encourage activities involving people of all ages?

a. recreational programs.....

b. cultural programs.....

c. basic literacy programs.....

d. special classes.....

e. if other, please specify

19. Does your school cooperate with other community organizations and agencies?

Yes

No

20. How does your school cooperate with other community organizations and agencies?

a. advisory councils.....

b. joint planning.....

c. interagency communications.....

d. sharing of personnel.....

e. sharing of financial resources.....

f. sharing of physical resources.....

g. if other please specify

21. Is your school available for community use?

Yes

No

22. When is your school available for community use?

a. every evening.....

b. on weekends.....

c. during holidays.....

d. during the summer.....

e. all year round.....

23. Does your school encourage a study by students of problems and issues of significance to the community?

Yes

No

24. How does your school encourage a study by students of problems and issues of significance to the community?

a. special task forces.....

b. public forums/meetings.....

c. interagency cooperation.....

d. written policy.....

e. if other, please specify

25. Does your school foster a sense of community?

Yes

No

26. How does your school foster a sense of community?

a. organization of "get-togethers" at the school.....

b. participation in community activities/projects.....

c. services for community members.....

d. program for community betterment.....

e. if other, please specify

27. Overall, what is the most important way in which your school becomes involved with your community? Why?

28. What community related curriculum have you developed or implemented this year? Comment on the effectiveness of this curriculum.

29. How have you facilitated or coordinated effective cooperation and liaison between the school, its teachers and other community agencies and the community at large? Comment on the effectiveness of these practices.

30. What have been two or three major accomplishments of the community school program this school term?

31. Do you have other comments you would like to make?

TEACHER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

During this interview, I will ask you questions about your school and how it involves itself with the community. I will be conducting this interview in four Designated Community Schools and four non-Designated Schools in Alberta. These interviews will be used to verify and clarify, and elaborate on information obtained through the questionnaires of comparative study of Designated Community Schools and non-Designated Schools in Alberta.

Your answers will be treated anonymously: only a summary of the comments will be reported.

1. Do you implement curriculum that is related to real life situations in the community?

   Yes

   No

2. How do you implement curriculum that is related to real life situations in the community?

   a. field trips.....

   b. guest speakers.....

   c. study of the local community.....

   d. study of community services.....
      please specify

   e. use of community materials in the classroom.....

   f. work experience (internship).....

   g. classes in the community taught by
      community resource people.....

   h. special projects in the community.....

   i. exchanges.....

j. other, please specify

3. Do you involve parents in the school?

Yes

No

4. How do you involve parents in the school?

a. parental curricular advice.....

b. classroom volunteer.....

c. member of task force.....

d. resource person in classes.....

e. advisory committee.....

f. committees, please specify.....

g. if other, please specify

5. Does your school involve community members other than parents in your school?

Yes

No

6. How does your school involve other community members in the school?

a. community member advice.....

b. classroom volunteer.....

c. member of task force.....

d. resource person in classes.....

e. advisory committee.....

f. committees, please specify.....

g. if other, please specify

7. Does your school emphasize broad-based participation in decision making? (e.g. advisory groups, consultation with those affected by decisions)

Yes

No

8. How does your school foster broad-based participation in decision-making in the school?

a. staff meetings.....

b. parental advisory group.....

c. student advisory group.....

d. formal communications program (goal setting, dealing with conflict, problem solving, effective meetings, planning, and decision making.).....

e. special meetings, please specify.....

f. if other, please specify

9. Are students used as resource personnel in your classroom?

   Yes

   No

10. How are students used as resource personnel in your classroom?

    a. across age tutoring.....

    b. coaching.....

    c. small group work.....

    d. community service projects.....

    e. if other, please specify

11. Does your school offer programs for adults?

    Yes

    No

12. What kinds of programs does your school offer for adults?

    a. educational.....

    b recreational.....

    c. cultural.....

    d. social.....

    e. if other, please specify

13. Do you utilize resources available from community organizations and agencies?.

Yes

No

14. How do you utilize resources available from community organizations and agencies?

a. resource personnel.....

b. materials.....

c. field trips.....

d. if other, please specify.....

15. Is your classroom available for community use?

Yes

No

16. Do you encourage a study by students of problems and issues of significance to the community?

Yes

No

17. How do you encourage a study by students of problems and issues of significance to the community?

a. special learning units.....

b. special projects.....

c. if other, please specify

18. Does your school foster a sense of community?

Yes

No

19. How does your school foster a sense of community?

a. organization of "get-togethers" at the school.....

b. participation in community activities/projects.....

c. services for community members.....

d. program for community betterment.....

e. if other, please specify

20. What is the most important way in which you get involved with the community?

21. Are there other comments that you would like to make?

COMMUNITY MEMBERS/PARENTS INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

During this interview, I will ask you questions about your school and how it involves itself with the community. I will be conducting this interview in four Designated Community Schools and four non-Designated Schools in Alberta. These interviews will be used to verify and clarify, and elaborate on information obtained through the questionnaires of comparative study of Designated Community Schools and non-Designated Schools in Alberta.

Your answers will be treated anonymously: only a summary of the comments will be reported.

1. Have you been involved with this school this year?

   Yes

   No

2. In what ways have you been involved with the school this year?

   a. program participant.....

   b. guest speaker.....

   c. curricular advice.....

   d. classroom volunteer.....

   e. member of task force.....

   f. resource person in classes.....

   g. parent advisory committee.....

   h. committees, please specify.....

   i. if other, please specify

3. In your opinion, does this school obtain community input for decisions made in the school?

   Yes

   No

   No Answer

4. How does your school foster community input in decision-making in the school?

   a. community council.....

   b. formal communications progra
      (goal setting, dealing with conflict, proble
      solving, effective meetings, planning, and
      decision making.).....

   c. special meetings, please specify.....

   d. if other, please specify

5. Does this school offer programs for adults?

   Yes

   No

6. What kinds of programs does your school offer for adults?

   a. educational.....

   b recreational.....

   c. cultural.....

   d. social.....

   e. if other, please specify.....

INTERAGENCY REPRESENTATIVE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

During this interview, I will ask you questions about your school and how it involves itself with the community. I will be conducting this interview in four Designated Community Schools and four non-Designated Schools in Alberta. These interviews will be used to verify and clarify, and elaborate on information obtained through the questionnaires of comparative study of Designated Community Schools and non-Designated Schools in Alberta.

Your answers will be treated anonymously: only a summary of the comments will be reported.

1. Please describe your agency and the services its offers.

2. In what way(s) has your agency/organization cooperated with this school?

   a. advisory councils.....

   b. joint planning.....

   c. interagency communications.....

   d. sharing of personnel.....

   e. sharing of financial resources.....

   f. sharing of physical resources.....

3. Has the school avoided duplicating the services that your agency offers?

   Yes

   No

4. How?

5. Has the school helped your agency to provide better/more services to the community?

   Yes

   No

6. How?

7. What has been the role of this school in interagency cooperation?

8. What improvements should be made in interagency cooperation with this school?

9. Do you have any other comments?

STUDENTS INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

During this interview, I will ask you questions about your school and how it involves itself with the community. I will be conducting this interview in four Designated Community Schools and four non-Designated Schools in Alberta. These interviews will be used to verify and clarify, and elaborate on information obtained through the questionnaires of a comparative study of Designated Community Schools and non-Designated Schools in Alberta.

Your answers will be treated anonymously: only a summary of the comments will be reported.

1. In what way(s) does the curriculum in this school relate to real life situations in the community.

   a. field trips.....

   b. guest speakers.....

   c. study of the local community.....

   d. study of community services.....

      please specify.....

   e. use of community materials in the classroom.....

   f. work experience (internship).....

   g. work study.....

   h. classes in the community taught by community resource people.....

   i. special projects in the community.....

   j. exchanges.....

   k. other, please specify.....

2. How does your school involve parents in the school?

   a. parental curricular advice.....

   b. classroom volunteer.....

c. member of task force.....

d. resource person in classes.....

e. advisory committee.....

f. committees, please specify.....

g. if other, please specify

3. How does your school involve other community members in the school?

a. community member advice.....

b. classroom volunteer.....

c. member of task force.....

d. resource person in classes.....

e. advisory committee.....

f. committees, please specify.....

g. if other, please specify.....

4. Does the school encourage student participation in decision making?

Yes

No

5. How does your school foster student participation in decision-making in the school?

a. student advisory group.....

b. formal communications program (goal setting, dealing with conflict, problem solving, effective meetings, planning, and decision making.).....

c. special meetings, please specify.....

d. if other, please specify.....

6. How are students used as resource personnel in your school?

a. across age tutoring.....

b. coaching.....

c. small group work.....

d. community service projects.....

e. if other, please specify.....

7. How does your school encourage activities involving people of all ages?

a. adult credit programs.....

b. adult basic literacy programs.....

c. special classes.....

d. if other, please specify

8. How does your school cooperate with other community organizations and agencies?

a. advisory councils.....

b. joint planning.....

c. interagency communications.....

d. sharing of personnel.....

e. sharing of financial resources.....

f. sharing of physical resources.....

9. Does your school encourage a study of problems and issues of significance to the community?

Yes

No

10. How does your school encourage a study of problems and issues of significance to the community?

a. special task forces.....

b. public forums/meetings.....

c. interagency cooperation.....

d. written policy.....

e. if other, please specify

11. Does your school foster a sense of community?

Yes

No

12. How does your school foster a sense of community?

a. organization of "get-togethers" at the school.....

b. participation in community activities/projects.....

c. services for community members.....

d. program for community betterment.....

e. if other, please specify.....

13. Overall, what is the most important way in which your school becomes involved with your community? Why?

14. Are there other comments that you would like to make?

Questions to Each Respondent for Each 1986 Research Question

Respondent Group	Study Question								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Community School									
Principals	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Coord's				*	*	*	*	*	
Teachers				*	*	*	*	*	
Parents						*	*		
Comm. Members						*	*		
Non-Comm. School									
Principals								*	
Teachers								*	
Parents								*	
Comm. Members								*	
IUCSC	*							*	
Friends	*		*				*	*	
School Bd. Rep's	*		*	*		*		*	*
Ass't Deputy Min's	*	*							*

Interview with Interdepartmental Community School Committee (IDCSC) Members

Name _____
Dept _____
Date _____

(RFP II 1.)

1. What is the role of your department vis-a-vis the Community School Program?

2. Does your department contribute any specific services?

3. Does your department contribute funds to
   the Executive Director position?

   Community School Grants?

   Community School Friends?

   Meeting Costs?

   indirect costs?

4. Does your department receive any specific benefits from the program?

5. What are the most important decisions taken by this committee?

6. How are decisions reached by the committee?

7. Are there any ways in which the functioning or purposes of the committee could be improved?

Are there alternatives to this committee that might be more appropriate and functional?

8. How does the committee carry out the following functions and how effective is it in each function:

information service

consultation service

inservice education

preservice education

educational and community school building specifications

regular monitoring of designated community schools

evaluation of designated community schools.

9. What kinds of decision is the Executive Director empowered to make?

To whom do you think the Executive Director should report?

10. Do you as an IDCSC member sit on any other community school committees or have any other direct role in community school related activities?

11. What involvement has the IDCSC had with the Advanced Educational Liaison Committee?

(RFP II 8.)

12. How great a <u>commitment</u> to the 10 dimensions of the community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

13. How great an <u>understanding</u> of the 10 dimensions of a community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

14. Do you see any other way of promoting Community Schools other than the current way of identifying the most committed schools and giving them money?

Interview with Assistant Deputy Ministers

(RFP II 2.)

1. To what extent is your department interested in continuing its involvement with the Community School Program?
   committee member?
   direct staff?
   indirect staff?
   financial support?

2. What impact does your department currently see itself having on the program?

3. Is there likely to be any change in the impact your department would like to have on the program in the near future?

(RFP II 1.)

4. What perceptions do you have of the operation of the IDCSC Committee?

   Are there ways in which the functioning or purposes of the IDCSC could be improved?

(RFP II 9.)

5. What are the future implications for Community Schools as a result of block funding?

Community School Friends Interview

Name _____
Address _____
Telephone _____
Date _____

(RFP II 3.)

1. Are the guidelines for approving community schools satisfactory?

2. Are the procedures for approving community schools satisfactory?

3. Should the procedures for gaining approval be streamlined or simplified?

(RFP II 7.)

4. How adequate is community school funding for
   secretarial support

   community use of facilities

   flexibility?

(RFP II 8.)

5. What are the biggest obstacles to a school becoming a community school?

6. What are the most common kinds of assistance you provide to schools in the process of helping them develop a charter?

7. How great a commitment to the 10 dimensions of the community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

8. How great an understanding of the 10 dimensions of the community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

(RFP II 1.)

9. What are your perceptions of the operation of the IDCSC Committee?

10. Are there ways in which the functioning or purposes of the IDCSC Committee could be improved?

(RFP II 4.)

6. What is the impact of the Community School Program on school staff, support staff (including caretakers), students, interagency people, parents and community members?

   To what extent does the Community School Program affect the teachers' extra-curricular load?

7. Does the community school concept affect completion of diploma requirements?

(RFP II 5.)

8. What is your role in terms of the community school operation?

   How much of your time does community school operation take?

   What do you have to give up or reassign to make this time available?

   How much time would you spend on your community school role if the school did not receive community school grants?

9. What improvements would be desirable in the community school position descriptions?

(RFP II 6.)

10. Do you see a possible alternative to the community school definition?

11. Are there any other programs you know of that accomplish some of the same results as the community school program?

12. Would you recommend any different funding arrangements from those currently in place?

(RFP II 7.)

13. How adequate is community school funding for

secretarial support

community use of facilities

flexibility?

How do you access the community school grant?

(RFP II 8.)

14. How great a <u>commitment</u> to the 10 dimensions of the community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

COMMUNITY SCHOOL STUDY
Superintendent and Chairman of the School Board

Survey Completed by: Superintendent _____ Chairman of School Board _____
for School Jurisdiction _____

1. Are the guidelines for approving community schools satisfactory?

2. Are the procedures for approving community schools satisfactory?

3. Should the procedures for gaining approval be streamlined or simplified?

4. What perceptions do you have of the IDCSC Committee?

5. What effect has the Community School Concept had on School Board policy?

6. What is the impact of the Community School Program on school staff, support staff (including caretakers), students, interagency people, parents and community members?

7. To what extent does the Community School Program affect the teachers' extra-curricular load?

8. Does the Community School Concept affect completion of diploma requirements?

9. Do you see a possible alternative to the community school definition?

10. Are there any other programs you know of that accomplish some of the same results as the community school program?

11. Would you recommend any different funding arrangements from those currently in place?

12. How great a <u>commitment</u> to the 10 dimensions of the community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

13. How great an <u>understanding</u> of the 10 dimensions of the community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

14. Does the Secondary School Program Revision affect the community school activities? If so, how?

QUESTIONS FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL STUDY
ADDITIONAL TO THOSE ASKED IN THE LAZARUK STUDY

School_____
Date _____

Community School Principal

(RFP II 3.)
1. Are the guidelines for approving community schools satisfactory?

2. Are the procedures for approving community schools satisfactory?

3. Should the procedures for gaining approval be streamlined or simplified?

(RFP II 1.)
4. Did you have a fair hearing when your school's community school charter was presented?

5. What other perceptions do you have of the IDCSC Committee?

15. How great an <u>understanding</u> of the 10 dimensions of the community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

(RFP II 9.)

16. Does the Secondary School Program Revision affect the community school activities?

ADDITIONAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Community School Coordinator, Curriculum Coordinator, Further Education Coordinator, Teachers

School _____

Staff Position _____

_____

Date _____

(RFP II 4.)

1. What is the impact of the Community School Program on school staff, support staff (including caretakers), students, interagency people, parents and community members?

2. To what extent does the Community School Program affect the teachers' extra-curricular load?

3. Does the community school concept affect completion of diploma requirements?

(RFP II 5.)

4. What is your role in terms of the community school operation?

   How much of your time does community school operation take?

   What do you have to give up or reassign to make this time available?

How much time would you spend on your community school role if the school did not receive community school grants?

5. What improvements would be desirable in the community school position descriptions?

(RFP II 6.)

6. Do you see a possible alternative to the community school definition?

7. Are there any other programs you know of that accomplish some of the same results as the community school program?

8. Would you recommend any different funding arrangements from those currently in place?

(RFP II 7.)

9. How adequate is community school funding for

secretarial support

community use of facilities

flexibility?

How do you access the community school grant?

(RFP II 8.)

10. How great a commitment to the 10 dimensions of the community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

11. How great an understanding of the 10 dimensions of the community school concept is needed for a school to become a functioning community school?

Additional Interview Questions
Community School Parents, Community Members

School _____
Interviewees _____
Date _____

(RFP II 6.)

1. Do you think the definition of community schools should be changed in any way?

2. Are there any other programs you know of that accomplish some of the same results as the community school program?

(RFP II 7.)

3. How adequate does community school funding seem to be for
   secretarial support

   community use of facilities

   flexibility?

Additional Interview Questions
Control School Principal, Teachers, Parents and Community Members

School _____
Interviewees _____
Date _____

(RFP II 8.)

1. What would it take to make your school an official community school?

2. Would it be in your school's best interest to become an official community school?

3. What practical obstacles would prevent or slow down your school's becoming an official community school?

4. Do you feel that although your school is not a designated community school, it nevertheless operates similarly to the way a community school operates (e.g. community use of facilities, adult programs, involvement of community agencies etc.)?